7.

A LETTER

TO THE

Rev. JOHN MILNER, M.A. F.S.A.

AUTHOR OF THE

CIVIL AND ECCLESIASTICAL

HISTORY OF WINCHESTER.

[Price Half a Crown.]

A LETTER

TO THE

Rev. JOHN MULLINS, M.A. F.S.A.

ON

HISTORICAL MANCHESTER.

BRITISH MUSEUM

[Price One Crown.]

A LETTER

TO THE

Rev. JOHN MILNER, M.A. F.S.A.

AUTHOR OF THE

CIVIL AND ECCLESIASTICAL

HISTORY OF WINCHESTER,

OCCASIONED BY HIS

FALSE AND *ILLIBERAL ASPERSIONS* ON THE

MEMORY AND *WRITINGS* OF

Dr. BENJAMIN HOADLY,

FORMERLY BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

BY ROBERT HOADLY ASHE, D.D.

His mihi *dilectum nomen*; *Manesque verendos*,
His saltèm accumulem donis, et fungar amico
Munere! Non totus, raptus licèt, optime Præsul,
Eriperis: redit os placidum, moresque benigni,
Et venit ante oculos, et pectore vivit imago.

JORTIN. in Vitâ Erasmi, vol. II. p. 42.

LONDON,

Printed by J. NICHOLS:

And sold by R. BICKERSTAFF, Corner of Essex-street, Strand; B. LONG, Winchester; J. COOKE, Oxford; J. DEIGHTON, Cambridge; B. COLLINS, Salisbury; Messrs. CRUTTWELL, Sherborne; W. MEYLER, Bath; and T. SKELTON, Southampton.

1799.

A LETTER

TO THE

Rev. JOHN MILNER, M.A. F.S.A.

AUTHOR OF THE

CIVIL AND ECCLESIASTICAL

HISTORY OF WINCHESTER,

OCCASIONED BY HIS

EXCURSIONS AND REFLEXIONS ON THE

MEMORY AND WRITINGS OF

DR. BENJAMIN HOADLY,

FORMERLY BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

By ROBERT ANDREW ASHE, D.D.

BRITISH MUSEUM

LONDON.

A LETTER, &c. &c. &c.

SIR,

THE Literary World muſt for ever acknowledge its obligations to you for your two volumes containing the Hiſtory of Wincheſter. For moſt of the Hiſtorians, who have hitherto attempted to give us the Antiquities of *our** *venerable* and *Royal* City, ſeem, like ſwallows, to ſkim along the ſurface without dipping ſcarce a feather in the ſtream. But you, Sir, drink *deep* of the ſtream; and whoever has once taſted of that fountain of knowledge, which your pen has opened, cannot but thirſt for more. And had you not already been admitted a Fellow of the Society of

* The expreſſion of *our* city eſcaped from my pen—but I will not eraſe it—for, although I had *not* the *honour* of being *born in* Wincheſter, I cannot *perſuade myſelf* that I am an *alien*, as *both* my families reſided there ſo many years juſt as my bud of life began to open. You muſt allow me to exclaim, in the language of a Roman poet,

"Neſcio quâ *natale* ſolum dulcedine captat!!!"

Antiquaries, that learned and reſpectable body of men would have reflected credit upon themſelves by thus rewarding you for your indefatigable labours.

This, Sir, is not the language of adulation. Nor am I anxious to conciliate your good opinion before I begin my defence of that great champion of *civil* and *religious liberty*, Dr. Benjamin Hoadly, formerly Biſhop of Wincheſter. I will candidly confeſs that, when I firſt took up your book, I was naturally prejudiced againſt the writer, as I had been informed that you had attacked the *memory* and *writings* of my worthy relation.

In my different advertiſements, and in the title-page to this letter, I have called your *aſperſions* on *Biſhop Hoadly falſe* and *illiberal*. Feeling, as I do, the poignancy of your *ſatire*, I can uſe no ſofter language. How far I am juſtified in applying ſuch *harſh-ſounding* epithets to you, let every liberal and unprejudiced reader determine.

To enable the publick to form a juſt, and true opinion of the matter in queſtion,

tion, I ſhall preſent them with faithful extracts from ſuch parts of your Hiſtory of Wincheſter as I may have occaſion to examine in juſtification of my injured friend.

I begin with your reflections on the *monument* of *Biſhop Hoadly*, vol. II. p. 32:

"Having ſurveyed the South tranſept, "it will be proper to return into the nave "of the *church*, to the ſteps leading into "the choir. In this ſituation we cannot "fail admiring the elegant ſcreen of the "Compoſite *order*, ſaid to have been "raiſed by *Inigo Jones*, in the reign of "Charles I. which, though a defect in "the general building, is highly beautiful "in itſelf; as likewiſe the two bronze "ſtatues of the ſame *prince*, and of his "father, James I. which fill the two "nitches in it. Nor can the eye, in this "ſituation, be reſtrained from fixing on "that inimitable medallion of Biſhop "Hoadly, againſt the pillar on the left "hand, over his tomb and epitaph. The "hard ſtone here aſſumes the ſoft foldings "of the Prelate's ſilken ornaments, and

" the cold marble is animated with his " *living, ſpeaking features.*

" But what an incongruous aſſociation " of emblems do we here find crowded in " the margin! The *democratic* pike and " cap is in *ſaltire*, with the *paſtoral croſier*; " *Magna Charta* is blended with the new " Scripture, as equally the ſubject of the " Biſhop's meditations. In vain, how- " ever, we look for the maſk and dagger, " to record the *dramatic labours* of the de- " ceaſed, from which he is certainly enti- " tled to as much honour as from moſt of " his other writings. One remark more " will ſtrike us before we loſe ſight of this " monument. The column againſt which " it is placed has been cut away to a con- " ſiderable depth, in order to make place " for it, evidently to the weakening of the " whole fabrick. Thus it may be ſaid, " with truth, of Dr. *Hoadly*, that, both " *living* and *dying*, he undermined the " Church of which he was a *prelate.*"

In copying this paſſage, Sir, from your work, I have been ſo ſcrupulouſly exact as to preſerve a trifling miſtake in the ſpel-

ling

ling of *one* word, viz. *nitches* (line 9), inſtead of *niches*; and alſo *two grammatical errors*, ſuch as "cannot *fail admiring*" (line 4), which the nature of the Engliſh language will not bear, and (line 33) "both *living* and *dying*." You, no doubt, meant to have *written* "*help admiring*," or "*fail* TO admire." I aſk, how could Dr. Hoadly *undermine* the *Church* by *dying*? In the plenitude of your *wrath* and *indignation* againſt *him*, you ſeem not to have conveyed your meaning with your uſual perſpicuity. I do not heſitate to ſay, that, in a *future edition* (if you ſhould be ſo *illiberal* as to retain the ſame ſentiments, and not be diſpoſed "*parcere ſepultis*"), it will be neceſſary to correct the paſſage thus: "that, both *living*, and even after "*his deceaſe*, *he*," &c. &c.

Perhaps, in the cool hour of reflection, you may convince yourſelf that, by caſting illiberal aſperſions againſt a *lifeleſs monument*, you will add as little to your own character as *Achilles* has done to his by dragging the cold remains of *his* enemy around the walls of *Troy*.

But

But I haſten to contraſt *your* account of the *emblematical ornaments* on the *monument* of Biſhop Hoadly with a much more *ſatisfactory account*, written by his ſon, Dr. John Hoadly. As my uncle erected *this monument*, *he* certainly knew the *conceptions* of *his own* mind *as well as yourſelf*; and *he*, therefore, will be the beſt interpreter of his *own deſigns*. The original manuſcript is in my poſſeſſion; and I will here ſubjoin it for the inſpection of the curious, and, I hope, for your *private ſatisfaction*.

"A monument is erected to the memory
" of Dr. Benjamin Hoadly, the late Biſhop
" of Wincheſter, in a conſpicuous part of
" the Weſt iſle of that cathedral, as near
" as poſſible to the place of his interment.
" It conſiſts, principally, of a medallion
" of the Biſhop, as big as the life, very
" well taken from a ſmall one of Mr. Goſ-
" ſett, eſteemed, by the family and his
" moſt intimate friends, an exact and cha-
" racteriſtic reſemblance of his Lordſhip.
" The outline of the head is very happily
" marked, as it is of the whiteſt ſtatuary

" marble,

" marble, let into a ground of dove co-
" lour. This medallion reſts againſt the
" *mantle* of the *Garter* (of which *order* the
" Biſhops of Wincheſter are prelates),
" which, being ſuſpended above from the
" *arms* and *creſt*, flows down in noble
" folds of ſilk and velvet, nicely diſtin-
" guiſhed by the ſtatuary, and forms a
" beautiful back ground to the whole.
" The mantle returns again in front un-
" der the medallion, with its rich cords
" and taſſels, and falls eaſily over the
" architecture, of dove-coloured marble,
" which is raiſed from the ground, and
" ſupports the work. On the circular
" front of it are two tablets of white mar-
" ble, on which are engraven two *inſcrip-*
" *tions*, the *former* written by the *Biſhop*
" himſelf. About the *medallion*, on the
" *top* of the *architecture*, lie a few *emble-*
" *matical ornaments*, the *croſier*, the *rod*,
" and *cap* of *liberty*, two *rolls* of old MSS.
" the *one* of the *New Teſtament*, and the
" *other* of *Magna Charta*, inſcribed with
" ſome letters from each in the old Greek
" and Latin characters, all interwoven

" and

"and bound together by the cords of the "mantle above, and by a ſcroll on which, "in large characters, is his Lordſhip's "*conſtant motto*, VERITAS ET PATRIA, "Truth and my Country. The whole "is beautifully executed by Mr. Wilton."

Now, Sir, I will venture to ſay, that the two different accounts juſt given will ſtrike every reader. They appear, indeed, like two diſtinct views of the ſame object—ſeen, alas! through a different medium. I forgat to mention that my uncle Hoadly inſerted *his Account* in the London Chronicle, November 12—15, 1763; and alſo in ſeveral other periodical productions. To prevent the poſſibility of a *miſtake*, I have compared my Manuſcript with all of them, and find it correſponding in every reſpect. If then my uncle's ſtatement be true and correct, it muſt of neceſſity follow that your ſtatement is falſe and erroneous: to ſay nothing, at preſent, of ſome *miſtakes* which you have unfortunately fallen into by not confining yourſelf to matters of fact. In your Preface, you indeed profeſs to be guided

guided by the golden rule which Tully has preſcribed to every Hiſtorian — *Ne quid falſi dicere audeat, ne quid veri non audeat* — "Not even to *dare* to utter a "*falſehood*, and to be *bold* in aſſerting the "*truth*." Of this ſentence you ſeem to be particularly enamoured; for, it occurs alſo in your ſecond volume, where you triumph over the late Biſhop Lowth and the late Poet Laureate Warton, and talk of your friends Socrates and Plato, and of your attachment to *truth* — *Amicus Socrates, amicus Plato, ſed magis amica Veritas**. After ſuch profeſſions, I am aſtoniſhed to find that you have not *religiouſly* obeyed the ſacred laws of Truth; and cannot but aſk you the ſame queſtion that Sophocles puts into the mouth of Neoptolemus, when Ulyſſes tempts him to ſpeak a falſehood, in order to circumvent Philoctetes:

Ουκ αισχρον ηγη δητα τα ψευδη λεγειν;

Philoct. v. 109.

Do you not think it baſe to ſpeak things falſe?

* With thoſe *divine teachers* of morality it is pleaſant "Inter ſilvas Academi quærere *Verum*." Hor. And who does not venerate *Epaminondas*, that "ne *joco* quidem mentiretur?"

 If

If it *be diſgraceful* to *ſpeak* ſuch language, how much more diſgraceful is it in a grave writer to pollute his *Hiſtory* with what is not true?

I have a right to enquire upon *what authority* you aſſert (vol. II. p. 32) "that "*Biſhop Hoadly* is entitled to as much ho- "nour from his *dramatic* labours as from "moſt of his other writings?"

Pray, Sir, what *dramatic compoſitions* have you met with, in the courſe of your extenſive reading, that were *really* written by *his* pen? What are the PARTICULAR plays which, in your opinion, *entitle* him to ſo much honour? I will thank you to *point them* out to me, as I have never ſeen, or even heard of, *any*. Is it the *comedy* of the *Suſpicious Huſband* to which you attach ſuch conſiderable merit? That elegant comedy reflects great credit upon the author, and will continue to do ſo when the *fungous* growth of *pantomimical tragi-comedies* (which now diſgrace the Britiſh ſtage) ſhall wither, and be no more ſeen. That play was certainly written by Dr. Benjamin Hoadly, and publiſhed in 1747.

But

But it was the production of Dr. Benjamin Hoadly, a doctor of phyſick, and not of Dr. Benjamin Hoadly, the Biſhop of Winchester.

The writer of the *Suſpicious Huſband* was the *eldeſt* ſon of the Biſhop; he had the honour of being *phyſician*, not only to the houſehold of King George II. but alſo (at the *ſame time*) to his Royal Highneſs the Prince of Wales: a circumſtance which ought to be mentioned in his favour, becauſe the *contending parties* of the day had *broken* and *diſſolved* the tender ties of *filial* and *parental* affection, and divided the *Houſe of Hanover* againſt itſelf.

But I am wandering from my preſent deſign, which was, to point out what has, probably, occaſioned your *miſtake*, viz. *that this comedy* being publiſhed by Dr. Benjamin Hoadly, you either *did not*, or *would not*, *diſtinguiſh* between Dr. Benjamin Hoadly the phyſician, and his father who was a doctor of divinity; although you might have prevented this miſtake, either by a reference to the true and impartial account of the Biſhop's life, pub-

liſhed by his ſon; or elſe by conſulting the *dedication* to the *King* that is prefixed to the *Suſpicious Huſband*. This *dedication* was meant as an humble *tribute* of *gratitude* to *his Majeſty* George II. for this very honourable office conferred on the author in the royal houſehold.

If you doubt the truth of theſe aſſertions, I could wiſh to refer you to the Printer of this letter for additional ſatisfaction. But *perhaps*, Sir, you *have already* APPLIED to him on the ſubject, with the fond *hope* of ſeeing a long liſt of Biſhop Hoadly's *dramatic* compoſitions. Unfortunately for you, Mr. Nichols (beneath *whoſe roof* all the Biſhop's Works were publiſhed) can prove to you that Dr. Benjamin Hoadly, the *biſhop*, never wrote a *ſingle drama*.

What then becomes of your *illiberal aſperſion* on Biſhop Hoadly, by which you have *inſinuated* that he ſpent his time in writing plays? It muſt return, like duſt caſt againſt the wind, into your own boſom. Unleſs, therefore, you have *more authentic* documents than thoſe regularly conveyed to me by his Lordſhip's family,

you

you cannot but acknowledge that you are guilty of a MISTAKE, and that you have confounded together two different perſons.

It appears to me, from a peruſal of the various manuſcripts in my poſſeſſion, that the Biſhop was very uneaſy at the early attachment of his *two** ſons to theatrical compoſitions. Now, if his Lordſhip had *betrayed* a *ſimilar* taſte, it is natural to ſuppoſe that he would have *encouraged* them in their purſuit after "that bubble "reputation" *on* the ſtage, rather than have laboured to wean them *from* it. The two brothers, *Benjamin* and *John*, certainly wrote many of the *dramatic pieces* which were acted at the theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields in the year 1731. At that time the

* The *eldeſt (Benjamin)* was born February the 10th, 1705-6, and the *youngeſt (John)* was born October the 8th, 1711. They both received their claſſical education from the learned Dr. Newcome, and by their extraordinary abilities added a luſtre *even* to the *School* of *Hackney*. From the cuſtom of acting plays in our public ſeminaries (upon which occaſions the brothers diſtinguiſhed themſelves, particularly in the plays of Terence and Hughes's Siege of *Damaſcus*), they might have formed this *early* attachment.

youngeſt of the two brothers had but juſt attained to the 19th year of his age. They were patterns for FRATERNAL imitation—they were lovely in their "lives," and in their STUDIES they were not divided. To their UNITED PRODUCTIONS Mr. Rich was indebted for many overflowing houſes. "The *Contraſt* was acted at the "cloſe of the ſeaſon, in May 1731, for "five ſucceſſive nights, with univerſal "applauſe. This play, written by my "brother and me, was deſigned as a ſatire "upon the conduct and language* of "modern plays. The particular occaſion "of its *diſcontinuance* was a very good "letter in the *Grub Street Journal*, hu-"mouroufly repreſenting the propriety of "making the AUTHORS who had not "ſcrupled to ridicule the beſt dramatic "writers, *ancient* and *modern*, their great

* Mr. John Hoadly, in his *introduction* to the *Contraſt*, gives the *above* account in the fourth volume of his Manuſcripts. His friend Mr. Garrick frequently begged and entreated him to favour the world with ſome of his dramatic compoſitions; but his conſtant anſwer was, "My brother "and I made a *ſolemn* promiſe to the good Biſhop never to "*publiſh* any more plays—I cannot *violate* it."

"foes,

" foes, and who had acted ſo profeſſedly
" as *friends*, HONORARY MEMBERS of that
" *Society*. This letter, not only mention-
" ing AUTHORS (in the *plural* number),
" but being ſigned SALISBURY STEE-
" PLE, alarmed my brother ſo much,
" that, without ſtaying to conſult me
" (who had gone out of town to Cam-
" bridge on purpoſe, the better to avoid
" ſuſpicion), he thought it moſt adviſe-
" able to go directly to the BISHOP of
" SALISBURY, and let him into the ſecret
" before it came to be univerſally known,
" or might reach his ears with a worſe
" grace, and make him uneaſy without
" the poſſibility of a remedy. This infor-
" mation *alarmed* my *father* exceedingly—
" it *affected* his *health* and *ſleep*; and, on his
" feeling great uneaſineſs at thinking what
" a neſt of hornets it would naturally draw
" about our ears, and remembering what
" a *clamour* the name of *Hoadly* had raiſed,
" my brother, without the leaſt heſitation,
" complied with his *father's deſire*, that
" the whole ſhould be inſtantly quaſhed.
" At the firſt mention of it to Mr. Rich,

" WITH

" WITH THESE REASONS, he very honour-
" ably ordered the play-houſe copy and
" all the parts to be called in and re-
" turned into my brother's own hands.
" He gave up the whole to his father.
" And no more was heard of it until
" 1761, at the good Biſhop's death, I
" found the copy in a corner of his
" drawers at Chelſea, written on, with his
" *own* hand—*to be burned*—which, as he
" himſelf never did in thirty years, I have
" *ventured* to tranſcribe it (with a few
" alterations, which I then thought im-
" provements,) as a private amuſement
" for a few friends."

I forbear to make any comment on the long narrative here given. The facts will ſpeak for themſelves. Having, at length, *regained** poſſeſſion of all my *Hoadleian* Manuſcripts,

* Here it may be proper to offer my apologies for the length of time which has elapſed ſince I intimated, by an advertiſement, my intention of *defending* the *character*, &c. &c. of *Biſhop Hoadly*. However extraordinary it may appear, I DECLARE, Sir, that I never *heard* of your Hiſtory of Winchester *before* the *cloſe* of the laſt year. That its fame ſhould not have extended to Southampton until after the IId volume

Manuſcripts, I could adduce other collateral proofs, if neceſſary, to ſhew "that "*Biſhop Hoadly* never wrote, or compoſed, "any *one drama.*" Although you are pleaſed to *admit* him to the *honour* of a *ſitting* in the *Temple* of *Fame*, I rather think, that his Lordſhip would not have been ambitious of ſuch an honour. And as it appears, from his *theological* and *polemical* writings, that he had no *claim* or *title* to the *maſk* and *dagger* (which you ſo anxiouſly looked for), I leave THEM to your own diſpoſal—the *former* HE never *wore*, and the *latter* HE never uſed—for the only force he ever employed againſt his bitter enemies was *force of argument.* Indeed, arguments in *his* hands were like arrows in the hands of a giant; and his

lume was publiſhed is wonderful!!! The firſt intelligence of your attack upon the *Biſhop of Wincheſter* was announced to me by the *Dean* and *Chapter*, when I attended their AUDIT in December 1798. I was then informed, that *you had certain proofs* that Biſhop Hoadly was the writer of the *Suſpicious Huſband*, and of many other dramatic compoſitions. Unfortunately for me, all my books and papers have been packed up (previous to my removal from Hampſhire) for ſeveral months; and I have but *juſt* opened the boxes at Eltham in Kent—April 26.

quiver was full of them. *His* tongue was a ſtranger to ſuch cruel and harſh expreſſions as *you make uſe* of againſt him; nor *would his nature* ſuffer him to dip even his pen in gall.

It has juſt occurred to me, that you may have been deceived in the character of *Biſhop Hoadly* by the haſty account given of him in the *Biographia Britannica*—an account very unworthy of HIM, and by no means founded on facts. *This*, his ſon, Dr. John Hoadly, controverted, in a Supplement to that Work. The Editor of the *Britiſh Biography* (Vol. IX. p. 167), who has given a true and impartial account of Hoadly's *Life* and *Writings*, ſeems, in a note, to ſpeak of *his talent* for POETICAL COMPOSITIONS in a manner that a *prejudiced* writer might *miſconſtrue*.

You, probably, may have *heard of* the *particular* compoſition *alluded* to. And, when I add that it is of a *dramatic* nature, you will, no doubt, exult in the diſcovery, and fancy that you have brought *me* to a *confeſſion*. If this ſhould appear to be the caſe, after I have ſubmitted the Manuſcript

to

to your perusal, I will readily *do penance* for my folly. You must allow me to be a generous adversary, as I am furnishing you with arguments against myself. Be it so. The result of the enquiry may terminate widely different from your expectations; and the cause of my friend may thus appear in a new light.—The *Manuscript*, as contained in Volume the Xth, p. 65, runs thus—

"I am willing to preserve here an hasty *prologue* to *All for Love*, as an UNIQUE, written by my father—(and, as far as is *known*, the *only* copy of verses written by him), and now copied by me from his own *hand-writing*.

In the summer of the year 1718, Bishop Hoadly, and Dr. Samuel Clarke, and Sir Richard Steele, made a visit of some days, by invitation, at Blenheim-house; where he found the ladies and gentlemen of the family, and a few of the neighbourhood, had got up the tragedy of *All for Love*, to entertain his Grace the Duke of Marlborough, who had had, before this, some appearances of that paralytic stroke which

weakened his ſenſes, and at laſt brought on a total decay, and his diſſolution. Lady Bateman (one of his Grace's granddaughters, by the Earl of Sunderland), who played the part of *Cleopatra*, had in vain applied to Sir Richard Steele for a prologue on that extraordinary occaſion, and ſeemed much chagrined at the diſappointment. At night, when the family retired, the Biſhop deſired ſome pen, ink, and paper, might be brought to his chamber; and, the next morning, at breakfaſt, preſented to Lady Bateman the following prologue, which ſhe ſpake, the ſame evening, to the Duke and Dutcheſs—the Duke ſhedding tears at the unexpected compliment from a favourite grand-child."

A HASTY PROLOGUE TO ALL FOR LOVE,

ACTED AT BLENHEIM-HOUSE 1718,

WRITTEN BY *Biſhop Hoadly*,

AND SPOKEN BY LADY BATEMAN.

Whilſt antient dames and heroes in us live,
And ſcenes of Love and War we here revive,
Greater in both, in both more fortunate,
Than all that ever ages paſt call'd great;
O Marlbro', think not wrong that I thee name,
And firſt do homage to thy brighter fame.
Beauty and Virtue with each other ſtrove
To move and recompenſe thy early love;
Beauty *, which *Egypt's Queen* could never boaſt,
And Virtue ſhe ne'er knew, or quickly loſt!
A ſoul ſo form'd and cloth'd, Heaven muſt deſign
For ſuch a ſoul, and ſuch a form, as thine.
But, call'd from ſoft repoſe, and beauty's charms,
Thy louder fame is ſpoke in feats of arms.
The FABLED ſtories of great Philip's ſon
By REAL deeds the *world* hath SEEN outdone.

* Of the beauty of the Dutcheſs of Marlborough, if we had no other teſtimony, no other would be wanting than her portrait, by Kneller, and engraved by Smith; and the Duke was diſtinguiſhed, in the French army under Marſhal Turenne, by the name of the handſome Engliſhman.

The

The Cæſars that Rome boaſted yield their bays,
And *own* in juſtice thy ſuperior praiſe;
They fought, the empire of the world to gain;
But Thou, to break the haughty tyrant's chain:
They fought, t' *enſlave* mankind; but thou, to free
Whole nations from deteſted ſlavery,
"Their guilty paths to grandeur taught to hate
"By virtue, nor to bluſh for being great *."
This heap of ſtones, which Blenheim's palace frame,
Roſe, in this form, a monument to thy name:
This heap of ſtones muſt crumble into ſand;
But thy great name ſhall through all ages ſtand †.
In Fate's dark book I ſaw thy long-liv'd name,
And thus the certain prophecy proclaim:
"One ‡ ſhall ariſe who will thy deeds rehearſe,
"Not in arch'd roofs, or in ſuſpected verſe;
"But in plain annals of each glorious year,
"With pomp of truth, the ſtory ſhall appear.
"Long after Blenheim's walls ſhall moulder'd lie,
"Or, blown by winds, to diſtant countries fly,
"By him ſhall thy great actions all ſurvive,
"And by thy name ſhall his be taught to live."
O! cheriſh the remains of life; ſurvey
Thoſe years of glory which can ne'er decay:
Enjoy the beſt reward below allow'd,
The memory of paſt actions great and good!

* See Dryden's Aureng-zebe, A. 5, S. 1.

† Dr. Campbell, in his life of the Duke, "in Biographia Britannica," expreſſes the ſame idea, with equal elegance, in proſe, vol. II. p. 1352.

‡ It is probable, that his Lordſhip alluded to his friend, who then ſat next to him—for, Sir Richard Steele, in the 6th number of a paper called the Reader (dated May the 3d, 1714), had intimated a deſign of writing "A Hiſtory of the War in Flanders."

Now,

Now, Sir, ſuppoſing that you had gleaned ſome *imperfect* account of *this prologue*, you might eaſily have perſuaded yourſelf that Biſhop Hoadly wrote *the play* that was formerly acted at *Blenheim*, if I had not been able to mention the *very play (All for Love)* that *was* THEN, and THERE, acted—which play, it is needleſs to obſerve, was compoſed by *Dryden*. I have unfolded to your view every particular circumſtance connected with this theatrical exhibition, as *recorded* by his *ſon*. *His* veracity is unqueſtionable; and I doubt not but that you are already convinced of the FALLIBILITY of ORAL reports. With reſpect to the *prologue* itſelf, I ſhall only obſerve, that the moſt malevolent critic will find it difficult to draw any inference from it prejudicial to the memory of the writer. It can be conſidered only as an *eulogium* on the BRITISH ALEXANDER—compoſed for a *private* occaſion—at the earneſt ſolicitation of a favourite child, who was anxious to pour the oil of comfort into the wounds of an expiring parent. As an *unique*, it is certainly

tainly a literary curioſity—but as a *compoſition* it claims but little merit, and can ſcarcely be called a *dramatic* compoſition. If, however, you ſhould attach *that title* to it, you have too good a taſte to paſs ſuch encomiums upon *it* as you have done upon his Lordſhip's SUPPOSED *dramatic writings*. It remains, therefore, (as I before obſerved) for YOU to *point them out*, or to acknowledge *this part* of your *invidious* attack on *Biſhop Hoadly* to have been founded upon a *miſtake*.

What has been advanced in the former part of this epiſtle muſt have convinced you, that any attempt at *ſuch* a *diſcovery* muſt be fruitleſs. And the Publick will infer, from the candid and open manner in which I have laid this *unique* compoſition before them, that *he* never wrote any OTHER *dramatic compoſition*. Indeed, the ſilence of co-temporary writers upon this ſubject is an additional argument in ſupport of the fact which I am anxious to eſtabliſh. For, *when Envy* and *Malice* followed *Hoadly*, like his own ſhadow—"*when* (to borrow his own language)

a torrent

"*a torrent of angry zeal began to pour itſelf* "*out upon* HIM," is it poſſible, amongſt the numerous hoſt of *his profeſſed* enemies, that *not one of them* ſhould have diſcovered this *ſuppoſed* taſte for writing plays? The diſcovery might have been of uſe in raiſing a *laugh againſt him*, more eſpecially when their argumentative powers began to fail. Think you not that *Snape*, *Stebbing*, *Sherlock*, *Hare*, *Potter*, *Law*, *&c. &c. &c.* would have *rejoiced* in ſuch a diſcovery? Believe me, there were ſome amongſt the *convocation*, who, having *perſecuted him* with a "zeal not according to knowledge," would have turned their ſhafts of ridicule againſt his *dramatic writings*, when they found HIM *invulnerable* on that *holy ground* whereon he *ſtood triumphant*.

As *they did not*, and *you cannot*, produce any evidence of this kind *againſt him*, let the appeal be made to the tribunal of publick opinion; and I will venture to anticipate a *verdict in* HIS *favour*.

But there is ſtill *another heavy* charge brought by you againſt *him*. *It* however ſeems to reſt upon a very *weak* foundation;

and I rather *think* that you will be compelled to *ſhift* your ground. I beg leave to remind you of your own words—" One " remark more will ſtrike us before we " loſe ſight of *this monument.* The co- " lumn againſt which it is placed has " been cut away to a conſiderable depth, " in order to make place for it, evidently " to the *weakening* of the whole fabric. " *Thus* it may be ſaid with truth of Dr. " Hoadley, that, both *living* and *dying*, " he UNDERMINED the church of which he " was a *prelate.*"

Soon after I read the above (ſome time in January, 1799), I viſited Wincheſter, to ſatisfy myſelf how far the *Dean* and *Chapter* (*not* Dr. Hoadley) had *undermined* the Cathedral, by REMOVING *this monument* to its preſent poſition. The circumſtance of its *removal* was perhaps *unknown* to you. It was originally connected with *the column below* the ſteps leading up to the choir. That ſituation, indeed, was not ſo favourable for the diſplay of its beauties. Yet its *characteriſtic ornaments* (which you are pleaſed to call *incongruous emblems*) were

then

then protected, by iron rails, againſt ſacrilegious hands.

If the column *had really been* injured, the *ſurveyor* of the *works*, who attended its *removal*, ought to be *reſponſible*. But I have too high an opinion of the Dean and Prebendaries, to ſuppoſe, even for a moment, that they would have ſuffered their Cathedral to be injured upon *that*, or on *any other*, occaſion. The *meaneſt* artificer, whoſe right *hand* has little *cunning* to *forget*, is capable of confuting *this part* of your charge, by applying his *line* and *rule* to the column itſelf.

I have, however, higher authority to produce, viz. a letter from a Mr. Samuel Walldin, an architect in Wincheſter, in anſwer to a letter of *inquiry* from me.—The following is a true and faithful copy:

" Sir,

" Mr. Kernot, a few days ſince, having " put your letter into my hands, as Stone-" maſon to the Cathedral, I have, agree-" able to your directions, taken a ſurvey " of the late Biſhop Hoadly's monument.

"From a *ſtrict* examination of the pil-
"lar againſt which the monument is
"erected, although it was evidently cut
"away for the purpoſe, yet I cannot per-
"ceive the *ſmalleſt appearance* of its having
"*ſuſtained* ANY INJURY.

"The height of the pillar cannot be
"aſcertained without much difficulty.
"The diameter I found to be *ten feet*, and
"*four inches*. The girt, or circumference,
"I imagine to have been (before cut away)
"30 feet, 8 inches, from the oppoſite half,
"which is entire, girting 15 feet, 4 inches:
"but that cannot poſſibly be aſcertained
"with preciſion, *as the part* cut away,
"from appearance, ſeems to have been
"*different* from *the remaining oppoſite ſide*.

Signed, "SAMUEL WALLDIN."

Wincheſter, Thurſday.

The writer of the above omitted the *date*; but, as he will at any time confirm his opinion, *vivâ voce* (when queſtioned by you), it is of no conſequence. If his *profeſſional* ſtatement be true, I need not

aſk

ask you, "how it is possible, for a *small* "monument, fastened by little cranks in-"to a huge *Gothic*, OR *Norman* column* "(whose diameter is 10 feet, 4 inches, "and circumference 30 feet, 8 inches) "to *endanger* the *whole fabric?*" When a GRAVE HISTORIAN writes thus, I cannot believe that he is *serious*. And yet, if *the charge* be introduced *as a* pun, I am sorry to say, that it is a *pun* which a Winchester *boy* would be *ashamed of*.

How could *Bishop Hoadly* (whom the Historian of Winchester *trampled* in imagination beneath his feet) *undermine this* pillar, when *his remains* were at *peace* at some distance from it? Luckily for you, they were *at peace*. Had the Bishop possessed, when alive, the *satirical* talent of *Archilochus*, you would have been *fearful* of approaching even *his* tomb. The same *caution* would have been necessary as is in-

* Does not Mr. W—'s account of this very *column* militate against your *masonic doctrine*, in Vol. II. p. 18? "The ori-"ginal *Norman* pillars may be traced at the steps leading up "to the choir, where there was no occasion of *casing* them." In due deference to BOTH—I have called *it Gothic* OR *Norman*.

scribed

ſcribed on the monument of the Greek Satiriſt by *Julianus*,

Ηρεμα δη παραμειψον, οδοιπορε, μη ποτε τυδε
Κωπης τυμβῳ σφηκας εφεζομενας,

With cautious ſtep, O! traveller, paſs *this* tomb—
For—there 's a neſt of hornets in it's womb.

Forgive, Sir, this ſeeming digreſſion. I have been led into it by *your* nervous and pictureſque ſtyle of writing; "the cold "marble is *animated* by his *living*, *ſpeaking*, "features." In this we perfectly agree; for,

—*ſic* ille oculos, *ſic* ora ferebat.

Methinks I ſee him in my mind's eye. And, whilſt I am writing this letter in the preſence of the *very figure* of the *Biſhop*, which the chiſſel of Wilton has transferred to the monument, I cannot loſe the opportunity of a *dramatic* converſation.

H. Speak, I am bound to hear.

Gh. So art thou to revenge, when thou ſhalt hear—

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Adieu—adieu—adieu—remember me.—

If

If I did *not remember him*, I ſhould be unworthy to retain *that* name which HIS PRESENT MAJESTY, by PARTICULAR INDULGENCE, allowed me to PREFIX to my own. But, if I were to harbour a wiſh of *revenge* againſt you, or even to "*ſpeak* "daggers," I ſhould *degenerate* from the *diſtinguiſhing characteriſtic* of all *his* writings. And as you have "pledged yourſelf (in "the preface to your 1ſt vol. p. 17) not "only to *abandon*, but alſo to diſavow, all "ſuch errors, &c. &c. as are pointed out "to you with candour, and proved by "ſolid arguments;" I conclude, that you will not ſcruple to acknowledge that you have been *entirely miſinformed* reſpecting Biſhop *Hoadly's dramatic compoſitions*. You wiſely ſay, "errare humanum eſt." To *err* is certainly *human*. To *forgive* is divine. In writing, as well as in human life, we find, alas! that there is "*nemo* "*ſine vitiis*"—but yet, "optimus ille qui "minimis urgetur." Every one has his fault—but he is the beſt who has the feweſt to account for.

Of

Of the *gigantic* column which you *facetiouſly*, not *ſeriouſly*, ſay, "is *undermined* "by Dr. Hoadly," too *much* has already been ſaid. Let us leave *it* to ſpeak for itſelf; which, I hope, it will continue *to do*, not only for the ſake of the Dean and Chapter (who muſt be at the expence of building it up again—*if* it *ſhould fall*); but for the ſake of *your friend* Biſhop Morley, who is accidentally buried on the *other* ſide of it, and might therefore ſuſpect Biſhop Hoadly * to have had a hand in puſhing it *down*. But—"*amoto quæramus* "*ſeria ludo.*"

Far be it from me to diſturb the aſhes of the dead, or to caſt any reflections on the memory of *Morley*. All his ſucceſſors have been indebted to him (and amongſt them *Hoadly*) for the three epiſcopal pa-

* Vol. II. p. 75.—Your meditations and reflections, whilſt ſtanding *between* the tombs of *theſe two prelates*, may induce ſome of your readers to ſuppoſe, that your Hiſtory was written to ſerve a *particular* cauſe. I, however, *adopt* your *opinion*; "that there never were men more *oppoſite* in their *religious* and "*political* principles than the *two Biſhops* of this ſee, who here "lie *together*."

laces

laces which they have enjoyed at Wolveſey, Farnham-caſtle, and Chelſea-houſe. The *former* of theſe aroſe, under his hands, from the ruins of the old-demoliſhed caſtle; the *ſecond* he repaired at an immenſe expence; and the *latter* he *purchaſed*, and bequeathed to the ſee of Wincheſter. And many widows of the clergy of that dioceſe have found an aſylum in *his* little *college* near the Cathedral, where they have ſpent the evening of their lives in peace. Of theſe particulars it was natural for you to ſpeak in your hiſtory. Had you been content with paſſing due encomiums upon *Morley* without an invidious compariſon between him and *Hoadly*, I would have ſubſcribed, with pleaſure, to your opinion. But your *partial* preference in favour of the *former* is but too viſible; and it is remarkable, that you cannot diſguiſe it when ſpeaking of their reſpective monuments. From your own words let the reader draw his inference.—"We now paſs behind the "pillar againſt which Biſhop Hoadly's "monument reſts, adjoining to which, "at the bottom of the ſteps, is the ſepul-

"chre of that *ſtaunch* * old prelate Mor-
"ley, with an *intereſting* epitaph, com-
"poſed by *himſelf*, which, however, *boaſts*
"of nothing but his attachment to the
"cauſe of royalty. It is encloſed in iron
"rails; and over it *hangs*, by his *own ap-*
"*pointment*, his *mitre* and *croſier*."

As you have thought proper to bring *theſe two* prelates *together*, I cannot loſe ſight of them without aſking you a few queſtions.

* May not ſome of your readers think that you are rather TOO FAMILIAR with your friend *Morley*, when you apply the epithet STANCH to a Biſhop? and aſk you the queſtion which Hazael did, "what!—*is* thy ſervant a DOG?" The expreſſion would have been more appropriate, had you been ſpeaking of one of King Charles's POINTERS or BLOOD-HOUNDS. And do you not, in *effect*, call the *Preſbyterian Miniſtry* a PACK OF HOUNDS, when you ſay (Vol. I. p. 416), "that they GROWLED for more abſolute power?," &c. &c. A dog is unqueſtionably an emblem of fidelity. *Pope*, in one of his letters to *H. Cromwell*, Eſq. "gives us a modern "inſtance of *gratitude* TO a dog. He informs us, that the "chief Order of *Denmark* (now injuriouſly called the Order "of the *Elephant*) was inſtituted in memory of the fidelity "of a *dog*, named *Wild-brat*, to one of their Kings, who "had been deſerted by his ſubjects: he gave his *Order* this "motto (or to this effect), *Wild-brat was faithful*."

But you lament (p. 419), "that mankind are ſo inconſiſtent and unfeeling as to *attach ignominy* to a *dog*."

Is

Is it not extraordinary that you ſhould ſuffer the *paſtoral croſier* and *mitre* to hang *quietly* over the ſepulchre of M—y, when you treat with ſuch inſolent indignation the *characteriſtic emblems* on H—y's monument? *You* may believe, that M—y was "clothed with humility;" but I contend, that this *very ſimple ſepulchre* betrays ſtrong marks of *ſpiritual pride*. Have you not told us, that *thoſe viſible proofs* of *epiſcopacy*, the MITRE and *croſier*, were ſuſpended there by his OWN APPOINTMENT? And what occaſion was there for a Biſhop to *ſound* his *own praiſes*? The trump of *fame* more properly belongs to the Hiſtorian than the deceaſed. Why ſhould M—y, like a proud Phariſee, *boaſt* of himſelf? What merit was there in his being ſo ſtrongly attached to the cauſe of royalty, when he had received ſuch accumulated marks of regal favour, and "bore his bluſhing ho-"nours ſo thick upon him?" Had he lived four years longer, until 1688, and ſtill enjoyed the quiet poſſeſſion of his croſier and mitre under *William and Mary*, are *you certain*, that he would *not* have *taken*

the *oaths of allegiance* to *them*? He might, perhaps, have been too far advanced in years to have taken any *active* part in the *civil* and *political* revolution which was then effected; but, if HE had *ever* DEVOUTLY MEDITATED ON MAGNA CHARTA, OR PROPERLY *underſtood* the NEW SCRIPTURE, *he* would have rejoiced, like old Simeon, that *his* eyes had lived to ſee *that glorious light* ſpringing up amongſt the Gentiles, *which*, in conſequence of the RELIGIOUS *revolution* in the minds of men, may be conſidered as the *greateſt* of all *National bleſſings*.

Your ſentiments upon *this occaſion* are, no doubt, different from mine. But I beg leave to remind you of an excellent remark of your own *, that "Religion was the "hinge upon which moſt publick tranſ-"actions, and even the fate of kingdoms, "turned in the laſt century †. All men "were

* Vol. I, p. 437.

† And why may not this remark be extended to the *preſent* century? For, the *good ſeed* of Religion, which was ſown in this Country at the Revolution, did not *produce* fruit to *perfection* until *Reaſon* and *Chriſtianity* formed an *indiſſoluble* union

" were then violently zealous for ſome " ſyſtem or another, though, even in this, " they were generally influenced by party " principles, not by motives of conſci- " ence."

Whether or not *Morley* was *ever* influenced by *party principles;* I ſhall not ſtop to enquire. Nor do I mean to inſinuate, that the portrait which you have given us of him in your hiſtory is not an exact reſemblance of him, or that it is too highly coloured by your flattering pencil. I am only ſorry, that HE thought it neceſſary to *proclaim* aloud his *loyalty* upon his *own* tomb. If *Hoadly* had written *ſuch* an *intereſting epitaph* on HIMSELF, would he have eſcaped the cenſure of your pen? No. It would have been " all *vanity* and " *vexation* of ſpirit!!!" And yet *he* was as *firmly attached* to the *cauſe* of *Royalty*, under the different ſovereigns whom he

union under the *proteſtant ſucceſſion*; WHEN the nation found it abſolutely neceſſary to SHAKE OFF the *chains* of ANTI-CHRIST, and to ſend *bigotry* and *ſuperſtition* into PERPETUAL EXILE.

had

had the honour to ſerve, as ever *Morley* was to the *Houſe of Stuart*, both in THEIR *proſperity and adverſity*.

Even Envy herſelf muſt allow that the epitaph which Biſhop Hoadly wrote for HIS *grave* breathes nothing but the language of humility. I have ſubſtituted the word "grave" (from the *authority* of his Lordſhip's ORIGINAL MS.) inſtead of *monument*. His inſtructions are conveyed as follows,—"If I die at Chelſea (which is "moſt likely), I appoint my *burial* to be "at *Streatham* *, in Surry, near the place "which

* *Streatham* was always his beloved retreat during his life, and, if he had been buried *there*, his REMAINS might have found a ſafe retreat beyond the reach of the "*ſlings* and *arrows*" of the Hiſtorian of Winchester CATHEDRAL. His predilection for *Streatham* may be eaſily accounted for. The manner in which he became poſſeſſed of that living reflects equal credit upon the perſon who GAVE it, as well as upon him who RECEIVED it. And it would be injuſtice to the memory of his patroneſs (Mrs. *Howland*, grand-mother of the two laſt *Dukes of Bedford*, &c, &c.), not to inſert here Mr. Hoadly's acknowledgement to her for this ſingular obligation.—"This excellent lady, in the year 1710, when Fury ſeemed "to be let looſe, and to diſtinguiſh *me* particularly, ſhe her-"ſelf, unaſked, unapplied to, without my ever having ſeen "her,

"which I once fixed upon with Dr. Bul-
"lock, the Rector, who will remember
"it. No monument—but a handsome
"flat marble—near the grave—with the
"*following* inscription engraved upon it,
"and without the addition of one word
"of character." *His modest wish* did not even extend to a monument—nay, he expressly *forbade* it—and his only surviving son (the late worthy Chancellor of the Diocese) thought it *necessary* to make an *apology*, in the Account of his *Father's* Life (Vol. I. p. 11, folio edit.), "for
"having *disobeyed* HIM by erecting but a
"decent *monument* to his memory." But on this subject *you* have entertained a different opinion: and my *uncle*, without any intention, seems likewise to have given *offence* to you. For, although "your words" (when speaking of the *medallion*) may *appear*, to an indifferent reader, "smoother than oil," when *I* read your

"her, or been seen by her, chose, by presenting *me* to the
"Rectory of *Streatham*, then just vacant, to shew, in her
"own expression, "*that she was neither ashamed, nor afraid,*
"*to give me that proof of her publick regard at that critical time.*"

sarcastick

ſarcaſtick ejaculations on viewing the emblems which adorn it, I FEEL them to be "VERY SWORDS."

Still, however, I am diſpoſed to think, that you *would not have uſed* ſuch harſh and cruel expreſſions (as now diſgrace your Hiſtory) if you had previouſly ſeen the account which my uncle has given of his OWN DESIGN, when he cauſed the various emblems to be affixed to his Father's monument. If there be *any ground* for cenſure, it ſhould *attach to him*. And, with what eagerneſs would he have exclaimed—to *all* the enemies of Hoadly—in the words of the GENEROUS Niſus—

ME, ME, (adſum qui feci) in *me convertite* ferrum ! ! ! !

If the reader will have the goodneſs to turn back (to p. 4), he may convince himſelf, that THE INCONGRUOUS ASSOCIATION of *emblems* (which you complain of) depends entirely upon YOUR not clearly underſtanding their appropriate ſignification. The *paſtoral croſier* and *mitre* require no comment: they are the *inſignia* of *every* Biſhop. All the OTHER *emblems*—

the

the *wand* and *cap* of *Liberty*—the TWO ROLLS of old manuſcripts, inſcribed in old Greek and Roman characters from the NEW TESTAMENT, and alſo from MAGNA CHARTA, have reſpect to *his* conſtant motto, *Veritas* et *Patria* (TRUTH and his COUNTRY), and to the ARMS * of the *Hoadly* family. If you aſk, "What "IS TRUTH?" I anſwer—"THE GOSPEL." And, if you aſk again what *Hoadly* meant by "*Patria*", *his Country*? I muſt anſwer for him in *two words*, "*Magna Charta*." But, on *viewing* theſe *characteriſtic emblems* of Religious and Civil Liberty, you are pleaſed to ſay, "that the NEW SCRIPTURE

* If Mr. Milner will take the trouble of looking into the *Archives* which are depoſited in the College of *Heralds*, he may there ſee a literary curioſity, viz. an original letter, written by King Charles II. to the grandfather of Biſhop Hoadly—"*expreſſive* of his gratitude, for his ſervices in ef-"fecting his reſtoration; and, in token of his Royal favour, "his Majeſty was graciouſly pleaſed to deſire, that all per-"ſons, hereafter bearing or uſing the arms of Hoadly, "would attach, as a creſt to the ſaid arms, a *dove*, with an "*olive branch* in its mouth, as a perpetual emblem of his *Re-"ſtoration!!!*"—This dove (if you had ſeen it) might have been ranked amongſt the *incongruous* emblems—and the *pelican*, in the *arms*, would alſo have been an object of your *calumny*.—See p. 45.

" and MAGNA CHARTA were *equally* the ſub-
" ject of the Biſhop's meditations." I will meet your *illiberal inſinuation* in its fulleſt force, and acknowledge, that they WERE equally the ſubject of HIS meditations, whenever they were *equally* in danger from the *ſecret* and *open* attempts of the numerous Enemies both to CHURCH and STATE. And ſurely thoſe Great Pillars of the *Britiſh Conſtitution*, upon which our preſent and future happineſs muſt for *ever* reſt, were never in greater danger of being *levelled* to the ground than at CERTAIN *well-known* PERIODS in the preſent century. For, the very foundations thereof were *ſapped* and *undermined* by ſuch doctrines as were propagated by that *incendiary Sacheverell*. And his *friend Atterbury* (although *Biſhop* of Rocheſter) was ſo *attached* to the intereſts of the CHURCH of *Rome*, that he would, like Samſon, have pulled down the *pillars* of OUR Temple, &c. &c. &c. *even* if HE had been certain of periſhing beneath the *ruins*. Luckily for theſe Kingdoms, the enemies of the Eſtabliſhed Government, by *their*

DOCTRINE

DOCTRINE of NON-RESISTANCE, and by their PRACTICE of NON-ASSISTANCE, kept the balance pretty even. *Hoadly*, by ſtopping the progreſs of ſuch doctrines, ſaved his country, and received, as a reward for his labours, a publick mark of HER *approbation*, which I ſhall interweave with my ſubſequent remarks on your *general* attack upon his *writings* in the *firſt* volume of your Hiſtory.

To commemorate his *ſervices* in the *publick cauſe*, what emblem more proper than the *wand* of *Liberty* to be placed on his tomb? But this you have called by the odious title of the DEMOCRATIC PIKE *—an inſtrument

* Here, for once, your *claſſical* knowledge ſeems to have failed you. The *wand* and cap of liberty are ſpoken of by the learned Spence, in his Polymetis—(fol. edit. p. 147).—"Liberty you may eaſily know by her cap and *wand*." To this *wand* (or *rod*) Horace alludes, Ep. 1.

donatum jam *rude*—

and Perſius (Sat. V. v. 82.) ſpeaks of the cap of liberty—

hanc nobis pilea donant.

On which laſt-cited paſſage, an author, who tranſlated Perſius in 1673, makes the following curious obſervation—"At the manumiſſion of a ſlave, his head was *ſhaven* (or "*cropped*),

inſtrument of *modern* invention, and which is to be found in a neighbouring kingdom—*where*, alas! many thouſand deluded wretches daily kiſs thoſe CONSECRATED *pikes*, which they are *bound to plunge* into the breaſts of his Majeſty's proteſtant ſubjects, whenever *France* CAN afford them an opportunity of *riſing in a maſs*. By the epithet *democratic*, you would, no doubt, inſinuate that *Hoadly* was a *republican* in his political principles. He certainly was a *whig*, upon the true and ſolid principles of the Revolution. He was a lover of liberty—*yet* firmly attached to *monarchy*—and a zealous advocate for the ſettlement of *it* in the *proteſtant line*. He wiſhed to ſee UNIVERSAL *liberty*, if it were compatible with *National ſafety*. But he conſtantly reminds his readers of this

" *cropped)*, and then he wore the cap of liberty. The co-" lour of it was *white*." See Barten Holyday's Tranſlation of Juvenal and Perſius, p. 332.—The DEMOCRATIC PIKE is more properly a characteriſtic emblem of the *Gallic goddeſs* Liberty; and the colour of her *cap* is now *dyed red*, to remind her votaries of their univerſal call

— to wade through ſlaughter to a throne,
And ſhut the gates of Mercy on mankind!!!

great

great national truth, " that our Church " was ſaved by the Revolution, and can " be ſupported only by the *proteſtant ſuc-* " *ceſſion* *." Thoſe who dare to call the *Biſhop* either a *democrat* or a *republican* are total ſtrangers both to his PUBLICK and PRIVATE character, and to the general tendency of his works. Theſe appellations were cant expreſſions, uſed by the *Jacobites* (in 1715 and 1745) to *revile* and *leſſen* the defenders of Publick Liberty. But, in the preſent age, the expreſſions of *democrats* and *republicans* † (if we may judge from their love of liberty, as exemplified by French practices,) are ſynonymous terms for plunderers of the world, and murderers of the human race.

Whilſt you was exclaiming againſt the INCONGRUOUS aſſociation of emblems, how came you not to attack the PELICAN, which is in the DEXTER QUARTER of the *arms* of *Hoadly*? Perhaps, Sir, you could not *bear* to ſee IT amongſt his ſepulchral or-

* Vol I. p. 618.

† Amongſt *ſuch* monſters, God forbid that the name of Hoadly ſhould ever be mentioned!!

naments

naments—BECAUSE *Fox* (Biſhop of Winchester in the time of Henry VII.) SELECTED that bird as his FAVOURITE EMBLEM. Your remarks upon this occaſion are too *romantic* to eſcape notice.—Thus, in deſcribing *Fox's* works in the Cathedral *—"WHERE WE VIEW THE BREATHING STATUE OF THE PIOUS FOUNDER, RESTING UPON HIS CHOSEN EMBLEM, THE PELICAN." Again, p. 56, "The cieling is rich with the founder's arms and CHOSEN DEVICE, the PELICAN. This was intended by him to expreſs his ARDENT DEVOTION to the ſacrament of the altar"—"HENCE," you ſay, "his magnificent College at Oxford was denominated *Corpus Chriſti*, the BODY of Chriſt." So alſo, ſpeaking of the altar-piece, p. 39. "In the centre is the CHARACTERISTICAL *pelican*"—becauſe "this bird makes uſe of its beak to tear open its own breaſt, for the purpoſe of feeding its young ones with its blood." When I ſaw theſe paſſages, I fancied that I was reading a Hiſtory that was written in the 15th or

* Vol. II. p. 19.

16th

16th century. Biſhop Fox might INNOCENTLY uſe the *pelican*, and I mean not to cenſure *him* for his choice. He was deceived by the *prevailing* taſte for hieroglyphicks. But I ſcruple not to ſay, that *this very bird* (which you have, in a manner, conſecrated to *him*, and which you ſeem to view *almoſt* with the eye of *adoration*) is an *emblem* unworthy of a *Proteſtant Church*, if it be received according to YOUR interpretation of *its ſymbolical* meaning. Nay, it is unworthy even of your own Church. For, let us ſuppoſe that a perſon ſhould dare to erect an *abſurd*, *impure*, or *unclean* image over one of your altars—would you not have him *excommunicated?* Certainly. Now, Sir, it appears from Leviticus, chap. xi. v. 18, and Deuteronomy, chap. xiv. v. 17, that this very *pelican* is an IMPURE or UNCLEAN *bird*, and, as ſuch, *forbidden* to be EATEN by the Jewiſh Law. Is it not abſurd? is it not impious? is it not blaſphemous? to repreſent the Saviour of the World ſhedding his blood upon the croſs by a PELICAN, feeding its young with its blood! I cannot help

help exclaiming, in the words of Horace,

Quodcunque OSTENDIS mihi SIC *incredulus* odi.

No *corporeal* emblem can give us an adequate idea of *his* love and ſufferings for mankind. The one which you have ſelected is, of all others, the moſt improper. I have proved already, that *it* was always looked upon as an *unclean* bird. And I am ſorry to tell you, that the circumſtance of the *pelican's* feeding her young ones with blood is nothing more than a *romantick fable*. Of this *unwelcome* truth, you may be convinced, by referring to Parkhurſt's Lexicon, under the *Hebrew* root קא vomere, as a noun, with a formative ת final, קאת a ſpecies of *unclean* bird. It appears, from Edwards's Natural Hiſtory of Birds (part. 2. p. 92), and from Shaw's Travels, p. 428, that the *pelican*, like the camel, being frequently an inhabitant of the wilderneſs, "(where no wa-"ter is)," has "*a large bag or pouch under* "*its lower chap*, which ſerves, not only as "a REPOSITORY for its *food*, &c. but as a "net to catch it. In feeding its young "ones (whether this bag be loaded with

" water or ſolid food), the *onocrotalus*, or " *pelican*, SQUEEZES the contents of it into " their mouths, by ſtrongly COMPRESSING " it upon its breaſt with its bill; an action, " which might well give occaſion to the " received tradition, that the *pelican*, in " feeding her young, pierced her own " breaſt, and nouriſhed them with her " own blood." What then becomes of your *characteriſtical emblem?* I ſhould not expect to find ſuch an hieroglyphick NOW in veneration, even in the land of Egypt, notwithſtanding what the Roman Satiriſt ſays of the Religion of the Nile—

Quis neſcit——————————qualia demens
Ægyptus portenta colat? Crocodilon adorat
Pars hæc: illa pavet ſaturam ſerpentibus ibin.
Effigies ſacri nitet *auteâ—Pelicani* *,

Juvenal, Sat. XV.

If your perſuaſive pen ſhould induce any of your readers to adopt your *opinions*, a

* I have ventured to ſubſtitute *pelicani* for the word in the original, which ſignifies a ſpecies of ape. Philo Judæus de Decalogo has a ſtriking remark.—Σεβουσι μεντοι κροκοδειλους, κυνας, αιλουρους, λυκους, ορνεα, ιβιδας και ιερακας.—" They *make* Cro- " codiles, Dogs, Cats, Wolves, Birds, Ibis, and Hawks, " the *objects* of their *adoration*."

worſe than Egyptian darkneſs would ſoon overſhadow this land.

If you ſhould feel an inclination to rank the *pelican* amongſt the *incongruous aſſociation* of emblems on Hoadly's monument, &c. I muſt beg you to transfer your ſarcaſtical reflections to the College of Heralds, and cenſure them for allowing *our family* to uſe it in their arms. *Fiction* is the very eſſence of *heraldry*, as well as of *poetry*. *It* was intended by their arbitrary laws to repreſent a *true patriot:* no man ever deſerved that title more than *Hoadly*; and, I truſt, that it will ever be looked upon as a *lively emblem*, to inſpire us to *ſhed our blood* in defence of our RELIGION, KING, and COUNTRY *; and, in ſuch a cauſe, if there be one

"Pro patriâ timidus perire,"
Who fears to die for his dear Country's *rights*,

he would be unworthy the name of a Briton. By inſinuating that the Biſhop was

* THESE are, like the Order of the Bath, "Tria juncta "in uno."—They *appear* to be *joined together* by God; and I hope, that no *Britiſh Catiline* will, under the maſk of patriotiſm, dare to *put them aſunder*.

a *de-*

a *democrat* or *republican*, you wiſh to rob him of his *good name*—but in vain. For, he proved to a demonſtration, that *patriotiſm* and *loyalty* MAY be united. But I will *repreſs* my riſing indignation—and will "not ſet down aught in malice." When the *reader* is informed, that the Hiſtorian of Wincheſter is a *Romiſh Prieſt*, he will ceaſe to wonder at the manner in which YOU have attacked the *memory* and *writings* of Hoadly. *Your ſect* look upon him as an *heretic* Biſhop. You have *accuſed* him of UNDERMINING the *Church* of *which* he was a prelate. If this accuſation could be ſupported by even the ſhadow of an argument, he would *have deſerved* your *grateful* acknowledgments, rather than your *illiberal* aſperſions. But all Europe is convinced, that Hoadly contributed more, than any other writer, to UNDERMINE the ſandy foundations of the *Church of Rome*, and to guard the *Proteſtant ſucceſſion*, as it were, with a ſhield againſt the fiery darts of their enemies.

After the intimation given above, the mind of the reader will be ſufficiently pre-

pared for your partial criticiſm on Hoadly's writings, which I ſhall immediately copy from your *firſt volume*, p. 445.

" The only Biſhop who was raiſed to " the ſee of Wincheſter by George II. was " the famous Dr. Benjamin Hoadly, the " great champion of, what is called, the " *low Church*. This party gives up all " pretenſions to divine juriſdiction, the " power of the keys, the neceſſity of mi- " niſterial ſucceſſion, the authority of the " convocation, together with the certainty " of the 39 articles, and every other tenet " which the eſtabliſhed Biſhops of the laſt " century had conſidered as eſſential to the " idea of a Church. It is plain the admi- " niſtration, then in place, favoured this " ſyſtem, which diſarmed the Church, " and made it a mere tool of the State, by " the ſucceſſive preferments which its great " hero met with, namely, the ſees of Ban- " gor, Hereford, Saliſbury, and laſtly that " of Wincheſter, upon the death of Dr. " Willis; as alſo by its taking advantage " of his conceſſions to diſſolve the convo-

" cation,

" cation, which has never been allowed " by government to proceed to any buſi- " neſs ſince his time."

Theſe remarks are of the ſame kind as your *illiberal* aſperſions on the *monument* of my friend; and I muſt be allowed to ſay, that you have not confined yourſelf to matters of fact. What your object may be, in reviving the invidious diſtinction between the *High* and *Low-Church* *, I cannot pretend to determine. The " moderation" of the Eſtabliſhed Church is now " made known unto all " men:" and *Hoadly*, by his well-timed writings, is univerſally acknowledged to have given the *death-ſtroke to the principles of Civil and Eccleſiaſtical tyranny*. It was my intention to have written a long defence of his character and writings; but,

* " Think not the worſe of any man, becauſe he is called " a *Low-Churchman*, or *moderate man*. Theſe are names made " uſe of to revile thoſe who are the firmeſt friends to the *late* " *revolution*, and are always endeavouring to keep both Church " and State from being ruined, either by the heats and vio- " lences of Proteſtants, or by the arms and ſtratagems of Pa- " piſts."—Hoadly's Works, Vol. I. p. 622.

I was

I was fearful of being thought prejudiced in favour of both. And, the nearer view I take of either, the more I am inclined to ſuſpect myſelf of partiality. I ſhall, therefore, adopt the ſentiments of co-temporary writers, and occaſionally interweave ſelect paſſages from his own works. And I truſt, that you will not, like an unjuſt Judge, paſs ſentence of condemnation upon him, without allowing him to ſpeak in his own defence.

Before we can form a juſt opinion of any writer, it is abſolutely neceſſary to ſend our imaginations back to the age in which he lived and wrote. Without this clue to conduct our wandering ſteps, we may be in danger of loſing ourſelves in the labyrinths of error. From a want of recollecting, that Biſhop Hoadly lived during thoſe *two rebellions* in 1715 and 1745, which convulſed the *Britiſh Empire* to its baſe, many writers have ſuſpected him of favouring republican principles. He ſaw and dreaded the poſſibility of an union *then* between the *Papiſts* and the *Diſſenters*; and therefore invited the latter to unite with the Church

of England. He wiſhed to convince them, that their prejudices againſt us were moſt of them imaginary; and he pointed out to them the neceſſity of joining in the common cauſe; and ſhewed the *reaſonableneſs* of their *conformity* to the *Church of England*. He repeatedly requeſts, that his readers would not extend his arguments to other times. "I deſire it may be *re-* "*membered*, that I confine myſelf to the "*preſent times*; and to *thoſe* Diſſenters "only who continue to ſeparate from the "Church, for the *reaſons* there repre- "ſented *." His mode of treating this ſubject, in another part of his works, does equal honour both to his head and heart †. "Are ſome men to be repreſented to you "as enemies to the Church, becauſe they "are zealous for the toleration of Proteſt- "ant Diſſenters. Now, I entreat you to "conſider.

* Reaſonableneſs of Conformity, Vol. I. p. 187.

† See (Vol. I. p. 619) his ſerious advice to the good people of England, "ſhewing their *true intereſt*, and their *true* "friends." Every page of this letter (which is not ſufficiently known) might be read with profit in the preſent poſture of affairs. It clearly eſtabliſhes this important national truth, "*that*

" conſider. Thoſe who are ſo unhappy
" as to differ in opinion from the *Church*
" *Eſtabliſhed*, muſt either be borne with,
" or they muſt be perſecuted. The bear-
" ing with them hath reconciled the con-
" ſciences of many to our worſhip. The
" dealing hardly with them hath eſtranged
" their minds from us. If you would have
" them *ever* reconciled to the Church, no-
" thing but mild methods can do this.
" And then, I farther beſeech you, do
" not conſult your paſſions, your anger,
" and your hatred, on this occaſion; but,
" look into the Goſpel, and read the New
" Teſtament. *See* if you can meet with
" any thing *there* of moleſting, and in-
" juring, and ruining, your neighbours,

" *that* a *general union* is the beſt way to repel the *common dan-*
" *ger.*" Commune periculum concordiâ propulſandum, ſays Tacitus—words worthy to be written in letters of gold! I cannot but join with the Scholiaſt, in his exclamations upon theſe words. O! verba aurea! utinam imbibamus! Nempè hoc eſt quod Hermocrates ille Syracuſanus pulcherrimè monuit, apud Thucyd. lib. IV. Τες δε ΑΛΛΟΦΥΛΟΥΣ επελθοντας ἁθροοι, ΗΝ ΣΩΦΡΟΝΟΥΜΕΝ, αμυνωμεθα. Ειπερ και καθ' ἑκαστες βλαπτομενοι, ξυμπαντες κινδυνευομεν. *Extraneos* advenientes, ſi ſapimus, juncti repellemus. Quoniam ſinguli etiam ſi *lædimur*, univerſi periclitamur.

" in

" in order to make them profeſs the ſame " doctrines, or worſhip God after the " ſame manner that you do."

Are theſe the ſentiments of a *democrat* or *republican?* Impoſſible. And yet it was from ſuch paſſages as theſe, that his enemies drew inferences ſo prejudicial to his real character. It will be difficult for you, or any other perſon, to ſelect any part of Hoadly's voluminous works to which the dangerous doctrines of *republican principles* may be attached. On the contrary, he was remarkable for his *loyalty* and *attachment* to four ſucceſſive ſovereigns, viz. Queen Anne, King George I. George II. and George III. And the *father* of his preſent Majeſty (when Prince of Wales) was ſo well convinced of the Biſhop's LOYAL and PATRIOTIC exertions, that his Royal Highneſs was pleaſed to ſignify his gracious approbation in a manner too flattering to be concealed from the publick eye. His Royal Highneſs's letter * is dated

* The *original* is in my poſſeſſion.

Leiceſter-Houſe, June 27, 1746.

My Lord,

In anſwer to your letter, I will tell you with truth, that I am glad to have had it in my power to give you a TOKEN of my GRATITUDE for the ſervices done formerly to my family.

Believe me

Your affectionate

FREDERICK P.

When the *ſon* of a King, then upon the Throne, and the father of his preſent Majeſty, condeſcends to write THUS to an individual—who can be ſo weak as to ſuppoſe, that theſe *grateful* acknowledgements were made to *Hoadly* for diſſeminating *democratick* principles?—principles which would have undermined the Houſe of Hanover, and muſt eventually have deſtroyed the very cauſe he was anxious to ſupport. His zealous labours in defence of Civil and Religious liberty (on principles diametrically

metrically-oppoſite to thoſe which have been abſcribed to him) entitled him to very different treatment formerly.

It appears, from Burnet's Hiſtory of the Reign of Queen Anne *, that "many ſe-"ditious books were written againſt the "Queen's title by the pens, no doubt, of the "Jacobites of the day. Whilſt theſe ſedi-"tious writings had free courſe for many "years, and were much ſpread and mag-"nified, one Hoadly, a pious and judici-"ous divine, being called on to preach "before the Lord Mayor, choſe, for his "text, the firſt verſe of the 13th chapter "to the Romans †, and fairly explained "theſe words of St. Paul—"Let every "ſoul be ſubject to the Higher Powers"—"that they were to be underſtood only

* Vol. IV. p. 278.

† Biſhop Hoadly told his ſon, the Chancellor of Wincheſter, that, when he preached this ſermon before Sir Owen Buckingham (viz. Sep. 29, 1705), he thought it the moſt inoffenſive ſermon in the world; but he ſoon found that it would give offence. Biſhop Bradford, who was preſent, ſaid to him, in the Veſtry—"Young man, every word of "what you have ſaid is TRUE; but I wiſh it may not give "you a great deal of *trouble*."

" againſt reſiſting good governors upon " Jewiſh principles, but that they had " no relation to bad and cruel governors. " And he aſſerted, that it was not only law- " ful, but a duty incumbent upon all men, " to reſiſt ſuch; concluding all with a vin- " dication of the Revolution, and of the " preſent Government. Upon this, a " great outcry was raiſed, as if he had " preached up rebellion. Several books " were written againſt him; and he *juſti-* " *fied himſelf* with a viſible ſuperiority of " argument to them all. It was eaſier to " keep up a clamour than to write a ſolid " anſwer."

To the teſtimony of Biſhop Burnet, I beg leave to add that of *Smollett*, in his Hiſtory of England *.

" Hoadly was a clergyman of ſound " underſtanding, unblemiſhed character, " and uncommon moderation; who, in " a Sermon preached before the Lord " Mayor of London, had demonſtrated

* Vol. X. p. 83.

" the

" the lawfulneſs of reſiſting wicked and " cruel governors; and vindicated the " late Revolution. By avowing ſuch doc- " trines, he incurred the reſentment of " the HIGH-CHURCHMEN, who ac- " cuſed him of having preached up rebel- " lion. Many books were written againſt " the maxims he profeſſed. Theſe he an- " ſwered; and, in the courſe of the con- " troverſy, acquitted himſelf with ſupe- " rior temper, judgment, and ſolidity of " argument."

But, there is a teſtimony upon *record* far ſuperior to the language of all the Hiſtorians that ever lived—I allude to the vote of the Houſe of Commons * in his favour, too honourable to be omitted.

1. " *Reſolved*, that the Rev. Mr. Benja- " min Hoadly, Rector of St. Peter's Poor, " London, for having often ſtrenuouſly " juſtified the principles, on which her

* This vote was paſſed Dec. 14, 1709, immediately after the publication of his book on Civil Government. See Journals of the Houſe of Commons, vol. XVI. p. 242.

" Majeſty

"Majeſty and the Nation proceeded in "the late happy Revolution, hath juſtly "merited the FAVOUR and RECOMMEND-"ATION of this Houſe. 2. That an hum-"ble addreſs be preſented to her Majeſty, "that ſhe would be graciouſly pleaſed to "beſtow ſome dignity in the Church on "Mr. Hoadly, for his eminent ſervices "both in Church and State."

A greater honour *Hoadly* could not have received; as it was the approbation of his Country, declared by its *repreſentatives*, one of the moſt auguſt aſſemblies upon earth, and which will remain, in the records thereof, an eternal monument to his memory—a monument more glorious and laſting, than pillars of marble, and triumphal arches—a monument which Envy, Hatred, and Malice, cannot *undermine*, and dare not attempt to *deface*.

Whoever accuſes Hoadly of propagating democratical principles, in any of his writings which were *then* publiſhed, is guilty of a kind of libel againſt *his* reputation, if

not

not againſt the dignity of the Houſe of Commons.

His eccleſiaſtical adverſaries were thunderſtruck, for a time, by this NOBLE RESOLUTION. Yet thoſe HIGH PRIESTS were ſoon moved with indignation againſt him, for his ſermon, preached before the King March 31, 1717, "On the nature of "Chriſt's Kingdom."—Herein he proved, beyond all contradiction, that Chriſt's Kingdom was *not* of this world; a doctrine new and ſurpriſing to the greateſt part of the *clergy* of THAT age, who ſeemed to have been contending "WHICH OF THEM "SHOULD BE THE GREATEST." To tell ſuch bigots that Chriſt's Kingdom did *not* conſiſt in *Mitres*, Lordſhips, Deaneries, Veſtments, Ceremonies, Spiritual Courts, Abſolutions, Perſecutions, &c. &c. &c. was a crime of ſuch a nature as Hoadly never could expect to have forgiven. You are pleaſed to mention the Rev. Charles Norris as the reconciler of THIS BANGORIAN CONTROVERSY. But, in ſelecting this gentleman to ſupport tenets which you wiſh to attach to the *Biſhop of Bangor* (Hoadly),

(Hoadly), you certainly have fallen into another miſtake; for, he entered into THAT SPIRITUAL WARFARE as a literary champion, ON THE SIDE of Hoadly AGAINST Dr. Sherlock. A ſtronger proof cannot be adduced than Mr. Norris's OTHER *production*; in which he expoſes the *inconſiſtency* of Sherlock's writings, even in the very TITLE-PAGE: "A Dia-"logue between Dr. Sherlock, *Dean of* "*Chicheſter* *; and Dr. Sherlock, *Maſter* "*of the Temple*. Publiſhed from Original "Words. Being a juſtification of Mr. "Sykes' Charge †, and a full Reply to what

* The DEAN did not at all approve of his writings againſt Biſhop Hoadly; and, in his later years, told a friend, "that "he was a young man when he wrote them, and he would "never have them collected into a volume." Biograph. Brit. vol. VI, part II. Suppl. p. 231. And Dr. Flexman has the means of proving, "that *Sherlock* ordered all MS papers on that controverſy, and ſome printed tracts not publiſhed, to be *burnt*, to prevent any poſthumous publication."

† It is evident, from the former note, that *Sherlock* never could *reconcile himſelf* unto *himſelf*. And, when *Sykes* ſhewed in his firſt letter "that Dr. Sherlock had taught the *ſame doc-*"*trines* which he condemned in the *Biſhop of Bangor*," multitudes fairly acknowledged thoſe tenets could not be right and defenſible by *him*, which were *falſe* and *heretical* when maintained

" what the Dean of Chichester has offered " to reconcile *himself* unto *himself*. By " Charles Norris, M. A."

Let any impartial reader judge, " whether it is probable that Mr. N. (who " wrote the *above* work) should advance " any thing in *his mode of* RECONCILING " the Bangorian controversy AGAINST " Hoadly?" But supposing, what you CANNOT prove, that he was guilty of such duplicity, are we to pay an implicit regard to *his* decision, without listening to the

tained by his Lordship. Yet, what was to be done? Dr. Sherlock was the only man that was able, by a plausible gloss, to represent the proceedings against that Bishop as *warrantable*. What remained therefore, but that those, who freely condemned him at first, should have the complaisance to be convinced by him, that it is the TEACHER, not the DOCTRINE, which is heretical, and by all means to be suppressed? These two *hierarchical heroes* might have addressed each other in the words of Virgil—

Mutemus clypeos, Danaûmque insignia nobis
Aptemus: dolus an virtus quis in hoste requirat?

" Let each in Argive arms his limbs disguise,
" And wield the bucklers that the foe supplies;
" For, if success an enemy attends,
" Who *asks, if fraud or valour* gain'd his ends?"

voices of others, who were ſo loud in *his* praiſes? The names of *Teniſon*, *Pyle*, or *Balguy*, were a credit to any cauſe which they undertook to eſpouſe. And the Rev. Mr. Herne, formerly of *Merton College*, *Oxford*, concludes his ſtatement of this *diſpute*, by ſaying, "I need not tell "you which ſide has plainly had the ſu- "periority in the controverſy"—and concludes his reflections with the higheſt poſſible compliments to Hoadly, "for his "*glorious endeavours* to deliver our PROPER- "TIES and CONSCIENCES from SLAVERY *."

The event of this controverſy is well known: but you have imputed the diſſolution of the Convocation, or *Eccleſiaſtical Parliament*, to a *wrong* cauſe. This miſtake ſhall be pointed out, when I have examined your other charges againſt the Biſhop, in which *you* accuſe him, in GENERAL terms, with his SUPPOSED brethren of the Low-Church, "of giving up all "pretenſions to *divine juriſdiction*." From what part of Hoadly's works do you prove, that *he* gives up ALL divine juriſdiction?

* See Vol. II. p. 397.

He

He admits *Chriſt* himſelf to be *King* in his own *Kingdom*—and to ALONE have a divine juriſdiction, or authority, over his true ſubjects. He was mindful of that DIVINE CAUTION, which Chriſt gave in his Goſpel, "*call* no MAN YOUR FATHER "upon the Earth;" for want of attending to which caution, "Spiritual wickedneſs" has been often *viſible* in *high* places. "The "only poſſible way to prevent *this* evil "(a friend * of Hoadly's informs us) is, "to *conſider*, that this ASSUMED AUTHOR-"ITY OF MEN, in matters of FAITH, pre-"vailed, from time to time, more and more, "till at length it ended in the ESTABLISH-"MENT of that KINGDOM OF THIS "WORLD, which we call POPISH RE-"LIGION. And here I cannot omit to "obſerve, that the word POPE, the ori-"ginal of which is the old Greek word "παππα, ſignifies FATHER; and it ſignifies "*father* in that very ſenſe, wherein the "text forbids us to CALL ANY MAN FA-"THER UPON EARTH. For, by calling a

* Dr. Clarke, vol. II. p. 64. His whole ſermon on Matthew, c. xxiii. v. 9. is worthy of attention.

" man FATHER here, our Saviour plainly
" means, HAVING regard to HUMAN, in
" matters of FAITH, or in *doctrines* of
" RELIGION. The APOSTLES THEM-
" SELVES did not take upon them to
" exceed their maſter's inſtructions. Much
" more inexcuſable are vain men, who in
" LATER ages have been guilty of ſo great
" and high a preſumption."

You next accuſe Hoadly of " *giving up*
" *the power of the keys.*" I am really aſ-toniſhed to think, that a ſenſible writer ſhould bring ſuch a weak accuſation. You ſurely cannot be SERIOUS. I muſt beg leave to aſk ſome *fooliſh* queſtions.—What power? *what keys?* Do you mean the KEYS of the Church? or, the KEYS which he *inherited*, and *bore* in his ARMS, as Biſhop of Wincheſter? If he had not DEFENDED the ESTABLISHED CHURCH with the *ſword* of the *Spirit* (or Goſpel), againſt *her enemies*, his Lordſhip would ſoon have loſt the KEYS and SWORD too, which are in SALTIRE, in his *epiſcopal* arms. And, with what exultation would

Biſhop Atterbury have carried the *keys* of our Church, and depoſited them at the feet of the *Pope!* His Holineſs would have condeſcended to have ſuſpended them in his *ſanctum ſanctorum*, BENEATH the GOLDEN * Keys, which (ſome think) were regularly handed down from St. Peter. Had the KEYS thus been "given up," *Hoadly* might have knocked at the *door*, but YOUR St. Peter would not have opened it unto *him*. And, it would have been too late, for *all ſuch heretics*, to cry

* I am aware, that Milton repreſents ONE of St. Peter's keys as being made with iron. *Lycidas*, v. 108.

Laſt came, and laſt did go,
The pilot of the Galilean lake,
Two maſſy *keys* he bore of metals twain,
(The *golden* opes, the iron ſhuts amain)
He ſhook his *mitred* locks, &c. &c.

The whole is a beautiful *picture* in *poetry*. The *alluſion* to Matt. c. xvi. v. 19. is finely imagined.

The Commentator on this paſſage remarks, "that Mil-"ton finely raiſes the character of St. Peter, by making him "the PILOT of the lake of Gennezareth, in Galilee"—and that he "hath likewiſe PAINTED POETICALLY the "TWO KEYS. But the MITRE, which has ſo fine an effect "in this picture," he adds, "Milton would NOT have AL-"LOWED him a very few years *afterwards*."

out,

but, "Woe unto you, LAWGIVERS; "for, ye have taken away the *key* of "knowledge: ye entered not in your- "ſelves: and them that were entering in "ye hindered." In an age ſo enlightened as the preſent, it is not neceſſary to obſerve, that the *keys* of the Kingdom of Heaven, given to St. Peter, can only be underſtood in a *metaphorical* ſenſe. No man, ſurely, ever thought Chriſt to be a DOOR, or a VINE, in the LITERAL ſenſe of thoſe words. And yet he has, in the New Teſtament, declared himſelf to be ſo. Thus St. Peter may be ſaid to have OPENED the DOOR of Chriſtianity, *becauſe* he was the *firſt* who preached the Goſpel of Chriſt. All the other apoſtles, no doubt, received a ſimilar *commiſſion* from their GREAT MASTER. All THOSE, ſince their time, *who* have conſcientiouſly preached the *ſame* Goſpel (without adding thereto, or diminiſhing therefrom), have equally fulfilled their truſt, by thus opening the *Kingdom of Heaven* to all *true believers*. Unleſs you can prove, that HOADLY has abuſed this truſt, by preaching, or writing, doctrines contrary

contrary to the fundamental truths of the Goſpel, *this part* of your accuſation will never affect his reputation, as a miniſter. Neither will any perſon, who has read Hoadly's Defence of *Epiſcopal* Ordination *, believe, that he "gives up the "*neceſſity* of MINISTERIAL SUCCESSION."— Neither did he deny the AUTHORITY of *Convocations*. It ſo happened, that a CERTAIN CONVOCATION, by abuſing their eccleſiaſtical truſts, *undermined* their own authority. SUCH charges carry their own confutation. But we now meet with an accumulation of charges, which SEEM to be of a more ſerious nature. THESE are levelled againſt the *whole body* of MODERATE or LOW-CHURCH men; but more pointedly againſt *Hoadly*, whom you are pleaſed to call THEIR GREAT CHAMPION. You accuſe them of giving up "*the cer-* "*tainty* of the 39 articles, and every other "tenet which the *eſtabliſhed* Biſhops of the "laſt century conſidered as *eſſential* to the "idea of a *Church*."

* Vol. I. p. 395.

Theſe,

Theſe, indeed, are *railing accuſations*, which you bring againſt him; but, inſtead of bringing them in this GENERAL way, I wiſh you had referred your readers to the PARTICULAR paſſages upon which you ground your aſſertions. But I forget myſelf; your opinion muſt have been given by PROXY *, as you could not *truſt* yourſelf to *read* the works of an author, who had dared to addreſs a letter to Pope Clement XI. on the IMPERFECTIONS of the *Church of Rome*. Yet, in the ſame letter, he certainly ſpeaks freely of many imperfections in the Church of England; for, OUR Church, at the beginning of the *preſent* century, had no great pretenſions to INFALLIBILITY. To the Biſhops of the *laſt* century, *ſhe* was indebted for fram-

* You, perhaps, adopted the ſcandalous *opinion* of the anonymous Editors of the *New* and *General* Biographical Dictionary, vol. VIII. p. 142.—"In his tenets, Hoadly was "far from adhering ſtrictly to the doctrines of the Church: "ſo far, indeed, that it is a little to be wondered, on what "principles he continued, throughout life, to profeſs con-"formity." This paſſage, which I conſider as a libel on the Biſhop, the Editors will probably condeſcend to alter, in their next Edition, &c.

ing

ing many ſalutary laws, and neceſſary articles, for the common cauſe of Proteſtant Chriſtianity. They wiſely ſhut the door of the SHEEP-FOLD againſt all thoſe wolves in ſheeps-clothing, who MIGHT wiſh for another opportunity of devouring the flock. Thoſe able reformers *wrought a good* work: they employed "the *axe*," as Milton ſtrongly expreſſes himſelf, "of God's *reformation*, in hewing "at the old and hollow trunk of Papacy." But, *they* thought many tenets *eſſential to the idea of a Church*, which are no longer found to be ſo. And they appear to have been as anxious for the viſionary *forms* of godlineſs, as for the *ſubſtantial powers* thereof.

"Men were at that time," ſays an ORTHODOX Divine *; who was brought up in the SCHOOL OF HOADLY, "in ſome "meaſure new to the ſubject of Church-"Eſtabliſhments: THEY had NOT formed

* The preſent Chancellor of the Dioceſe of Wincheſter, Dr. Sturges. See his letter to the late Biſhop of London, p. 28. The world will, I hope, ſoon be favoured with a new Edition of it, as it breathes the true ſpirit of CHRISTIAN LIBERTY.

" JUST notions of RELIGIOUS LIBER-
" TY; and Toleration was neither under-
" ſtood, nor practiſed. Theſe topics have
" been ſince diſcuſſed with freedom and
" ability; religious prejudices have worn
" off; and the preſent modes of thinking
" are become more liberal and tolerant.
" *They* did as much as could be expected
" from them."

Hoadly defended the *Eſtabliſhed Church* in every point wherein ſhe would wiſh to be defended. And what over-zealous *High*-Churchman can *do* more? Let any perſon, who doubts my aſſertions, convince himſelf, by looking into his Anſwer to the *Dean* of Worceſter's * Sermon on CHURCH-AUTHORITY vindicated; and his *Poſtſcript* to the *Biſhop of Oxford's* † Charge to his Clergy. He reſcues the Articles of the Church of England from interpretations, which *others* wiſhed to put upon them, by proving clearly, that SOME *writers* were deſirous of *impoſing heavy burdens*, which neither " *they* themſelves, nor their fa-

* Dr. Hare.

† Dr. Potter, afterwards Archbiſhop of Canterbury.

" thers,

" thers, were able to bear." His writings on the Reaſonableneſs of Conformity to the Church of England (addreſſed particularly to the Laity) will for ever prove his zeal in her true cauſe; for, he diſſipates, in a moment, every ſhadow of objection. And his doctrine of the neceſſity of a MINISTERIAL CONFORMITY * he illuſtrated by a long life of REGULAR PASTORAL LABOURS. No parochial miniſter ever diſcharged his duty more conſcientiouſly, or was ever more beloved by his pariſhioners. And, when their Majeſties George I. and George II. were pleaſed to fulfil THAT PROMISE, which Queen Anne had pledged herſelf to perform, in conſequence of the UNANIMOUS ADDRESS of the Houſe of Commons †, by raiſing him to the Sees of *Bangor*,

* Vol. I. p. 183.

† See Journals of the Houſe of Commons, vol. XVI. p. 246.—This deviation from her royal intention I have ever imputed to the ſecret influence of Atterbury, Biſhop of Rocheſter, who viewed *Hoadly* with a jealous eye. Their notions of Religious and Civil Liberty were as oppoſite as light and darkneſs: the *former* panted for ſacerdotal empire, and favoured the cauſe of ſuperſtition; the *latter* was a declared

Bangor, *Hereford*, *Salisbury*, and *Winchester*, he did not plume himself upon his *episcopal* elevation, but was almost adored by the clergy in his *respective dioceses*. How

clared enemy to *ecclesiastical tyranny*, and was anxious to free *Religion* from *superstition*. It was natural for *Atterbury*, who was the boasted champion of the *High Church*, to bear an antipathy to *Hoadly*, who had more than once foiled him, in single combat, even with his own weapons. And, of course, Atterbury would oppose the advancement of Hoadly in the Church. His honeyed eloquence often caught the too *credulous* ear of Queen Anne: he was, like the devil in Milton's Paradise Lost, frequently

——————————found
Squat, like a toad, close at the ear of Eve,
Assaying by his devilish art to reach
The organs of her fancy, and with them forge
Illusions as he list, phantasms and dreams.
B. IV. p. 799.

The ingenious author of the Memoirs of Sir Robert Walpole * proves, from most authentic documents, "that Queen "Anne was secretly inclined to favour the right of her bro-"ther, the Pretender, to the Crown of England; and her "intriguing favourite, Mrs. Masham, made no scruple to "declare to the French minister, whom Louis XIV. sent to "treat for peace, that the *Hanover family* was all *their aver-"sion*." The conduct of Bishop Atterbury, upon every occasion where there was a gleam of hope that the *Stuart family* might re-assume the throne, requires no comment.

* Rev. Mr. Coxe, vol. I. pp. 46, 47.

UNIFORMLY

UNIFORMLY and CONSCIENTIOUSLY he discharged his paſtoral duties, in his different ſtations of life, may be collected from his Charge to the Clergy of the Dioceſe, on his tranſlation, in 1736, to Wincheſter. I ſhall extract only ſuch parts as contradict the general aſperſions caſt on his character; and which he thought neceſſary to ſtate to HIS BRETHREN, who might have been deceived by the controverſial writers at that time, reſpecting his Religious tenets.

"There is a neceſſity for me to ſpeak "plainly upon this occaſion. I have been "ſo open and ſincere, through my life, as "not to make it any ſecret, that I differ, "in many points, from thoſe with whom "both inclination and intereſt would have "led me to agree, if I could. In this part "of my conduct, I have followed what "appeared to me, after the beſt inquiry, "to be the will of God, and the Goſpel "of Chriſt. The reproaches and ill treat-"ment I have met with, I can moſt eaſily "ſubmit to, and bear. The conſequences

"which

" which others have drawn for me, from
" words of mine, in ſome of my writings,
" particularly a late one, and the opinions
" they have arbitrarily imputed to me;
" ſome of them I abhor; others I am as
" utter a ſtranger to, as any of themſelves,
" and can as ſincerely diſown as they can.
" However unfavourably I have been re-
" preſented in other reſpects, this I can
" truly ſay, that as my conformity to the
" CHURCH ESTABLISHED was found-
" ed at firſt upon my inward conviction of
" its excellency above any other that I
" knew of; ſo, if I had, ſince that time,
" diſcovered any reaſon to repent, or any
" ſufficient objection, in point of conſci-
" ence, which ought to have prevented
" my firſt entering into it, I ſhould think
" myſelf obliged to give up all the TEM-
" PORAL ADVANTAGES, great as they ap-
" pear, which I have reaped from it. I
" have not one principle within me that
" can induce me to conſent to any thing
" that may hurt its ESTABLISHMENT; *not*
" from my thinking it all perfection, and
" incapable of amendment; but from my

" perſuaſion,

" perſuaſion, that nothing better is likely
" in this imperfect ſtate of ignorance and
" paſſion, to be put in the place of it.
" In the execution of my office amongſt
" you, I ſhall ſtrictly govern myſelf by
" thoſe laws which have entruſted me with
" ſuch an Adminiſtration. In matters
" plainly determined by authority, I ſhall
" expect, from all under my inſpection,
" the moſt EXACT CONFORMITY to the RU-
" BRICK and RULES they have ſolemnly pro-
" miſed to obſerve. As *I* can *truly* ſay,
" that I PUNCTUALLY, without ad-
" dition or diminution, practiſed them
" myſelf, in former ſtations of life; ſo, I
" ſhall faithfully and impartially require
" the ſame from others *."

Is this, Sir, the language of a REPUBLICAN *Biſhop*? Are theſe the ſentiments of a *Heterodox* Preacher of the LOW CHURCH? How groſſly then have you miſrepreſented *Him!!!* And how many may be deceived by your miſrepreſentation, who have not an opportunity of con-

* See Vol. III. p. 491, 492.

vincing

vincing themſelves of the contrary by a peruſal of the Biſhop's voluminous publications.

Thoſe who are converſant with his writings will find in every page arguments to confute your malicious inſinuations; and his actions always correſponded with his publick profeſſions.

His SUCCESSIVE preferments in the Church were ſo many proofs that thoſe *Sovereigns*, whom he had the honour of ſerving, were truly ſenſible of his ſervices. The ADMINISTRATION then in being felt their obligations to Hoadly for his indefatigable zeal in defence of Church and State.—You complain, that the ADMINISTRATION made the CHURCH a MERE TOOL of *the State*: the aſſertion is not, however, ſtrictly true. The STATE wiſely diſarmed the CHURCH of that *iron* ſceptre with which ſhe had *formerly* ruled the land. The ROMISH Church, on the contrary, has always MADE A TOOL of Government. Religion may exiſt without Government; but a Government cannot ſubſiſt without Religion. I adopt the opinion of

a writer

a writer * not UNKNOWN to you, who ſays, that "there certainly is a conſider-"able connection between a Civil Govern-"ment and an ESTABLISHED CHURCH: they "have a mutual influence, and the form "of the one ought to be, and generally is, "adapted to the other. Church-Govern-"ment will have a relation to political "principles: it is UNNECESSARY to ſay, "that it has had in our own country. "The Conſtitution of our CHURCH is ana-"logous, is adapted to our CIVIL CONSTI-"TUTION: the PRINCIPLES of the DIS-"SENTERS concerning Church-Govern-"ment are ill-adapted, are UNFAVOUR-"ABLE †, to ſome parts of it."

If

* The Rev. Dr. Sturges's Letter to Biſhop Lowth, p. 46.

† How much more UNFAVOURABLE muſt they be, both to CHURCH and STATE, if what the author of the Purſuits of Literature aſſerts be true! He ſeems to point at an unnatural UNION between a certain deſcription of *Diſſenters* and *Papiſts*.

"There is an *enthuſiaſm*, an οργασμος, in the profeſſors of "*Popery*, which, I know, *never forſakes* them. It is active, "where it can hardly be ſuppoſed. IT is ſaid even to PER-"VADE THE SQUABBLES OF A SOCIETY, SET APART FOR THE "PRESERVATION OF NATIONAL ANTIQUITY.—ROMISH BA-"RONETS

If there ever was an occaſion for the *Church* and *State mutually* to ſupport each other, the Hiſtory of Hoadly's times will convince you, "that the *Proteſtant Reli-* "*gion* could only be ſupported by the *Pro-* "*teſtant ſucceſſion* in the *Houſe of Hanover.*" When the affairs of this Nation were "on "the utmoſt edge of hazard," he ſtood forth as the champion of THE RIGHTS OF THE THRONE, and thoſe of *Engliſhmen*. He called on *Britons to awake*, and to remember the words of King William, in his laſt ſpeech—"Let there be no other diſtinction "heard amongſt us, for the future, but of "thoſe who are for the *Proteſtant Religion* "and the *preſent* eſtabliſhment, and of "thoſe who mean a POPISH PRINCE and "a FRENCH GOVERNMENT."

From ſuch paſſages as the foregoing, it is natural to account for YOUR aſperſions

"RONETS WILL BE BUSY; AND ROMISH PRIESTS will meddle. "The Secretary of that Society knows whether theſe hints are true." Preface, p. 25.

From ſuch a MIXED BREED, perhaps, that *monſter* MUTINY might ſpring, both HERE AND IN IRELAND. But we, fortunately, have a watchful and active MINISTER, who will ſtrike off the HYDRA'S HEADS *as often as they ſpring up.*

on the *writer*. But nothing can juſtify the MISTAKES already pointed out, but a *publick acknowledgment*, that you have been miſinformed; which you have pledged yourſelf to do in your Preface.

I could wiſh alſo to know, *on what authority* you have aſſerted, "That the ADMINISTRATION, THEN IN BEING, TOOK "ADVANTAGE OF HOADLY'S *conceſſions to* "*diſſolve the Convocation, which has never* "*been allowed by Government to proceed to* "*any buſineſs* SINCE." The beſt anſwer to this calumny ſhall be given in Hoadly's OWN words *to the Repreſentation*, drawn up by the Committee of the *Lower Houſe of Convocation*, concerning ſeveral *dangerous poſitions* and *doctrines* in the Biſhop of Bangor's *Sermon*, &c. &c.

"I had no other thought, deſire, or re-"ſolution, but to anſwer, in my place, "before the ſame Houſe, to which this "accuſation was deſigned to be brought; "and before thoſe worthy Prelates to "whom the appeal was to be made. But "it was thought proper (out of a ſincere

" regard, as I verily believe, to the inte-
" reſt of our Conſtitution in Church and
" State,) to put a ſtop to the ſitting of
" the Convocation; which (becauſe it has
" been UNKINDLY AND INDUSTRIOUSLY RE-
" PRESENTED AS THE EFFECT OF MY SOLI-
" CITATION, and an argument of my fear,
" and what I fled to for refuge, I AM
" OBLIGED TO DECLARE BEFORE THE WORLD)
" was done, not only WITHOUT MY SEEK-
" ING, but without ſo much as MY KNOW-
" LEDGE, or even SUSPICION, OF ANY SUCH
" DESIGN, until it was actually reſolved
" and ordered. As to the prorogation of
" the Convocation, it neither tends to
" hinder any light from appearing, which
" poſſibly can be procured, nor can it
" have ſuch an effect, in its natural con-
" ſequences; but the contrary; for, the
" debate is, by this means, taken from the
" bar of human authority, and brought
" to that of Reaſon and Scripture; re-
" moved from a trial by majority of voices
" (which cannot be a trial to be contended
" for, either by truth, or by the Church
" of England), and brought to that of ar-
" gument

" gument only. And certainly no Chriſtian " or Proteſtant can juſtly, and conſiſtently, " find fault with this."

The above ſtatement evidently proves the falſehood of your aſſertion, " that the " *Convocation* * was diſſolved in conſe- " quence of *his* conceſſions," &c. &c.

But

* The *report* of the SELECT COMMITTEE of the *Lower Houſe of Convocation*, reſpecting the Biſhop of Bangor's Sermon, &c. mentions in the TITLE-PAGE, " That it was " READ in the *Lower* Houſe May 10, 1717, and VOTED, " *nemine contradicente*, to be read and entered upon the books " of the Houſe." This was a palpable *forgery*, calculated to bias the minds of the publick againſt *Hoadly*; for, it appears, " That it never was approved of by the *Lower Houſe*, ſo as to " be an ACT of the Convocation." A proteſt againſt the proceedings of the *Committee (not of the Convocation)* will *unfold* this DARK BUSINESS to the publick view.

" Being perſuaded, in my own mind, that the word of " God is the only ſufficient foundation, upon which a true " Proteſtant can build his Religion; and that the doctrines " contained in the Biſhop's Sermon, preached before his " Majeſty on Sunday the 31ſt of March, 1717, and pub- " liſhed by his Majeſty's ſpecial command, are true Pro- " teſtant doctrines, and ſo perfectly agreeable to the word " of God, revealed to us in the Bible, that there ſeems no " juſt cauſe for the complaints made againſt them—which " complaints probably never would have been thought of, " had

But the teſtimonies of two other writers ſhall be added. The *firſt*, given by Mr. G. Coade, of Exeter—and the *other*, from the *pen* of Balguy.

"The attention of the publick was "AGAIN engaged *; and perſons of the "higheſt rank were extremely ſolicitous "for your protection.

"And here, alſo, your Lordſhip had "the honour to have one of the beſt, the "wiſeſt, and braveſt men that ever the "world produced, appear in your behalf: "I mean, the late King George; who was "graciouſly pleaſed, by his royal writ to "the Archbiſhop of Canterbury, to pro-"rogue the Convocation; whereby the

"had not ſome men, whilſt they were making open profeſ-"ſions of their loyal intentions, ſecretly deſigned to caſt a "blot and contempt on the Regal authority; and, under a "plauſible pretence of doing ſervice to the Church, laid "hold of an opportunity of ſhewing their perſonal hatred "and reſentment againſt the Biſhop.

"Subſcribed Feb. 14, $17\frac{17}{18}$,

"EDWARD TENISON †."

* Alludes to the *vote* of the Houſe of Commons.

† Archdeacon of Carmarthen, afterwards Biſhop of Oſſory.

"deſigns

" deſigns of your enemies were at once de-
" feated—a noble inſtance of royal juſtice,
" and paternal affection to his ſubjects!
" a ſtrange phænomenon in the political
" world! A monarch exerting himſelf in
" defence of his ſubjects' liberties, which
" multitudes of themſelves were eager to
" betray! an example highly deſerving
" the imitation of every ſovereign, but
" hardly to be paralleled! His generous
" ſoul was influenced by all thoſe ſenti-
" ments of humanity and compaſſion, with
" which Chriſtianity never fails to inſpire
" its real votaries. He could not forbear,
" voluntarily and unaſked, to interpoſe in
" behalf of an innocent and abuſed ſubject.
" This ſingle inſtance of his royal virtue
" will ever be recorded in the Britiſh an-
" nals, to his immortal honour; for
" which, generations to come will call
" him bleſſed."

Balguy's *character* of my injured friend is painted in colours too glaring for *you* to look on—but the *reſemblance* to the Biſhop will ſtrike thoſe who *knew the great original.*

" I may

"I may safely take upon me to affirm, "that nothing was more remote from "your LORDSHIP'S DESIGN, than ANARCHY "of any kind; that most certainly you "never meant to oppose order and just "rule, but merely usurpation and mis-"rule; that, far from intending to break "down the fences of Religion and Go-"vernment, your sole aim was to preserve "men from force and oppression, fetters "and bondage. And how laudable are "these views! how glorious such pur-"suits! I may add, how grievous, ob-"noxious, and perplexing! Whoever "engages in them must never expect a "gentle task. Discountenance, malevo-"lence, opposition, and misconstruction, "are sure to be his fate. But constancy "and patience surmount all difficulties; "and, while errors and prejudices are dy-"ing every day, TRUTH IS IMMORTAL.

"Of this nature were my original senti-"ments, PUBLISHED LONG AGO, and even "some years before you DISCOVERED, OR "CONJECTURED, FROM WHENCE they came.

"Let me be excused, if I observe, in re-

"lation

"lation to your Lordſhip, that the ac-
"quaintance which I have been ſince ho-
"noured with has been ſo far from alter-
"ing my ideas, that it has confirmed and
"fixed them; and whoever has the ſame
"opportunity will certainly receive the
"ſame impreſſion. Let him think as he
"may of your books and writings; *for*
"them, or *againſt* them; I aſſuredly
"know what he muſt think of the au-
"thor. Concerning the *former*, let POS-
"TERITY determine; concerning the *lat-*
"*ter*, they are beſt able to judge, who
"have been moſt intimate with your Lord-
"ſhip.

"I have now the pleaſure of finding
"your Lordſhip tranſlated to the ſee of
"Wincheſter.

"Should either you, or your enemies,
"think, that the *foregoing ſketch* of a cha-
"racter is overdrawn, or carried too far
"in any reſpect; why may not I refer
"both you and them to this DECISIVE
"EVENT? How could I have wiſhed for
"a more authentick teſtimony of the

" juſtice of my cauſe, and the truth of my " aſſertions? or, what ſanction, in the " eyes of all unprejudiced men, can be " thought ſurer or ſtronger? And yet " I would not take refuge even under this " authority, high as it is; were it not con- " feſſedly founded on *wiſdom*, more than " on power; and were it not, at the ſame " time, an open demonſtration, both of your " Lordſhip's FIDELITY TO THE CROWN *, " acting under its preſent happy limita- " tions for the PUBLICK GOOD; and, if I " may preſume to mention it, of the ſin- " cere *regard of the Crown to the true liberty* " *of the ſubject*, ſo often, and ſo *zealouſly*, " *defended* by your Lordſhip."

* To the ſame cauſe may be aſcribed the *royal favour* which his preſent Majeſty, George III. was graciouſly pleaſed to ſhew to my uncle Hoadly, by permitting him to DEDICATE HIS FATHER'S WORKS TO HIM. *Thus* did the *illuſtrious repreſentative* of the whole Houſe of Hanover give a PROTECTION to the POSTHUMOUS FAME of Biſhop Hoadly—*whoſe works* contributed, more than once, to ſupport the *tottering throne*, when UNDERMINED by the SECRET and OPEN attacks of Popery; and WHOSE ACTIONS prove him to have been a PUBLICK BENEFACTOR TO HIS KING AND COUNTRY.

The

The reader is at liberty to draw his own inference; and, I preſume, that he will not expect any farther evidence, reſpecting a circumſtance which occurred ſo long ago as the year 1717. Even you, Sir, cannot controvert the *ſolemn declaration* of the Biſhop of Bangor himſelf (already ſtated), or the teſtimonies of two *credible witneſſes*, who *publickly declared* *, in their writings, "That George I. without any ſolicitations "from *Hoadly*, diſſolved the *Convocation*." And you will find it alſo recorded in the Britiſh Biography †, that the King was ſo diſpleaſed at the conduct of SOME of the Committee of the Lower Houſe, that he would not ſuffer them to continue amongſt the number of his *Royal Chaplains*. If Hoadly could have been MEAN ‡ enough (which

* The Letter in defence of *Hoadly*, written by Mr. Coade of Exeter, was publiſhed *without* the Biſhop's knowledge.

† Vol. IX. p. 215.

‡ He appears, upon *this* occaſion, as well as upon all others, to have preſerved a magnanimity, which is the natural attendant upon innocence, and rectitude of conduct. He deſerved the motto of the Archbiſhop of Canterbury (*Teniſon*), "*Rupe immobilior*"—who was called, by all the friends of liberty, the "*Old Rock*," from the ſteadineſs of his conduct in THOSE DAYS OF TRIAL, in ſpite of all the arts of the Tories.

I will never allow) to have ſolicited the ROYAL INTERFERENCE to ſhelter him from the impending ſtorms, he would not have wiſhed his *bittereſt enemies* to have been thus *marked* with *diſgrace* upon his account.

It is univerſally allowed, that every man is the beſt interpreter of his own actions; becauſe he alone knows the impulſe of that mind which gave birth to thoſe actions. And ſurely every author may claim an excluſive right to put his own interpretation upon his own words. You would wiſh, no doubt, for this indulgence yourſelf: Let therefore Biſhop *Hoadly* be allowed to ſpeak for himſelf.

"The only *inferences* in my own favor, "which I wiſh to be drawn from what I "have publiſhed, are, that I never omit-"ted any one public opportunity, in "proper time and place, of defending "and ſtrengthening the true and only "*foundation* of all our *Civil* and *Religious* "*Liberties*, when it was every day moſt "zealouſly attacked; and of doing all in "my power, that all the *ſubjects* of this

"*Government*,

" *Government*, and this *Royal Family*, ſhould
" underſtand, and approve of, thoſe *prin-*
" *ciples*, upon which alone their happineſs
" is fixed, and *without which* it could ne-
" ver have been rightfully eſtabliſhed, and
" muſt, in time, fall to the ground. And
" alſo, that I was ready, whenever occa-
" ſion was offered, by the writings and
" attacks of *unbelievers*, and by the abſurd
" *repreſentations* of others, to defend a Reli-
" gion, moſt amiable in all its precepts,
" and moſt beneficial to *human ſociety*, in
" the only way proper; by ſhewing it, in
" its native light, with which it ſhines in
" the *New Teſtament* itſelf, free from all
" the *falſe paint* with which *ſome*, or the
" undeſerved *dirt* with which *others*, have
" covered it."

Theſe are the leading features by which we may diſtinguiſh his writings. Many of his *Biographers* have paſſed their judgement upon him, and upon his works, without a *ſufficient* acquaintance with either. What wonder then is it, if we ſhould find his character *miſrepreſented*, and *doctrines* aſcribed

ſcribed to him which *he never taught?* As to the age in which he lived, it was, in ſome reſpects, unworthy of *him*. He might have exclaimed *, in the language of Milton, that he was "*fall'n* on evil days"—yet,

"On evil days though fall'n, and evil *tongues*,"

He ſilenced them *all*. Their *ſlanders*, *calumnies*, and falſhoods, he forgave †: their real arguments and miſrepreſentations he ſolidly confuted. Thus, as a champion for *Truth*, *Religion*, and *Liberty*, he hath laid the greateſt obligations ‡ on his Countrymen, as *Men*, *Chriſtians*, and *Britons*.

After

* In one of his PRINTED letters (No. II.) to Lady Sundon, he exclaims, "How few are there in the world, who "would take the part upon them, of intereſting themſelves "for a man not in faſhion!" And in ANOTHER Letter (not YET publiſhed) he expreſſes himſelf *thus* to his confidential friend—"And you may remember, that the princeſs § ſpake "of *me* to yourſelf (before you ſet her right), as of a man, "who was *not* a CHURCHMAN ſo much as in *profeſſion*, &c. &c."

† Biog. Brit. vol. IX. p. 158.

‡ William Glanville, Eſq. one of the chief Clerks of the Treaſury, left his Lordſhip a legacy, in his laſt will; and, a

§ Queen Caroline afterwards.

few

After producing ſuch teſtimonies in ſupport of *Hoadly's* MEMORY and WRITINGS, and after having, I hope, convinced you of *ſome* MATERIAL MISTAKES concerning BOTH (which you have haſtily adopted, either from the ILLIBERAL OPINIONS OF OTHERS, or from PREJUDICES of your own), any *panegyrick*, from a pen like mine, would be ſuperfluous and unneceſſary. Beſides, I have already aſſigned my reaſons for declining ſuch an *invidious* taſk; and ſhall, therefore, prefer giving you my *real* ſentiments in the very language with which *he* has ſpoken of *Biſhop Burnet.*

few hours before his death, was pleaſed to aſſign the following reaſons for it:

" As to the legacy I have given to the Lord-Biſhop of " Bangor, I declare the ſame to be in teſtimony of the re- " ſpect I bear him, in defending the liberty of his Country; " and for his love to mankind; and for his endeavouring to " free Religion from ſuperſtition and tyranny (which worldly " intereſt and ambition have blended with it), and to reſtore " it to that ſimplicity and uſefulneſs which was the deſign of " its bleſſed author: for which his labour of love, he has " juſtly merited the eſteem and regard of all good men, in- " ſtead of that load of infamy and ſcandal, which the paſſions " of deſigning men have ſo maliciouſly and uncharitably " thrown upon him.

" WILLIAM GLANVILLE."

" To

"To his ſervices this Nation owes an "ETERNAL MONUMENT. I have a "paſſion for HIS GREAT NAME; but "no WORDS of MINE ought to be joined "to it. I would pay ſome tribute to a me- "mory, dear to *Liberty* and *Religion*, if "any thing, I could ſay, could add to a "REPUTATION and CHARACTER, acquired, "ſupported, and enlarged, by PASTORAL "LABOURS, unintermitted, from his ear- "lieſt youth, to his lateſt old age; and by "WRITINGS, which will give LIFE to the "name of HOADLY, long after the "names of his ENEMIES ſhall ceaſe to be "remembered. YOUR Church hath ever "paid him the *reſpect of fear*; and the "world will, in AGES to come, pay to "*his* MEMORY that love and admiration, "which the UNGRATEFUL of his own "age denied to *himſelf*."

I have the honour to ſubſcribe myſelf,

Sir,

Your obedient humble ſervant,

ROBERT HOADLY ASHE.

Eltham, Kent,
June 1, 1799.

BRITISH
3 AU 7
MUSEUM